Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-225
Friday
24 November 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-225 *24 November 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

TRUD Cites Chervov on Armed Forces Cuts *[AFP]* 1
Chervov Wants CSCE Talks to Include Naval Forces *[TASS]* 1
NATO's Galvin on Arms Control, Soviet Reforms *[TASS]* 1
Disarmament Discussed at Munich Symposium 2
USSR Arms Negotiator Speaks *[Hamburg DPA]* 2
NATO, U.S., Soviet Officials Cited *[TASS]* 2

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers To Meet Late Nov *[TASS]* 4
Communists' Role in Time of Reforms Viewed *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 4
CPCZ's Fojtik, DPRK Envoy Visit PRAVDA *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 4

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 23 Nov 5
Comments on Bush Speech, Malta Meeting *[TASS]* 5
Urges U.S.-USSR Nuclear Test Ban *[TASS]* 5
On Launching of U.S. Satellites *[TASS]* 5
Comments on CSSR Travel Curbs *[TASS]* 6
USSR 'Not Interfering' in CSSR *[Prague Radio]* 6
Previews Visit by Poland's Mazowiecki *[TASS]* 6
Gerasimov Urges 'Dialogue' in CSSR *[AFP]* 7
Perfilyev Cites Crowe on Reduced Military Threat *[IZVESTIYA 22 Nov]* 7
Adamishin Previews Gorbachev's Italy Visit 7
Views Economic Ties With Italy *[TASS]* 7
On Pope Meeting, Uniate Church *[TASS]* 8
Gremitskikh on Efforts To Form Lebanon Government *[TASS]* 8
Shevardnadze Briefs Deputies on Foreign Policy *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 8
Building of 'Common European Home' Progressing *[PRAVDA 16 Nov]* 9
CSCE Seminar on Military Doctrines Previewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Nov]* 11
Foreign Groups Thanked for GOSR Greetings *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 12

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Reaction to Bush Thanksgiving Day Address 13
Speech Reported *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 24 Nov]* 13
Commentary on Need for 'Agenda' *[Kuznetsov on Moscow International]* 13
Analyst Comments *[Kornilov on TASS]* 14
IZVESTIYA Reports Bush Interview *[24 Nov]* 15
U.S. Debate on Malta Meeting Viewed *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 17
Western Doubts About Malta Meeting Discounted *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 18
Genscher on Talks With Bush, Malta Meeting *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Nov]* 19
U.S. Withdraws Criticism of SFRY on Crackdown *[IZVESTIYA 17 Nov]* 20
TASS Notes Space Shuttle Landing Date 20
Canada's Prime Minister Continues Visit 21
Signs Joint Declaration *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 21
Seen Off by Ryzhkov on Tour *[TASS]* 21
Address to Business Group Noted *[Moscow TV]* 21

More on Address *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 21
Shevardnadze on Mulroney Visit *[IZVESTIYA 24 Nov]* 23

China

PRC Protest Over Continuing U.S. Sanctions *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Nov]* 26
State Planning Group Meets Yao Yilin in PRC *[Moscow International]* 26
New PRC Magazine Aims To Build Friendship *[PRAVDA 19 Nov]* 26

Northeast Asia

Commentator on Yakovlev's Japan Visit *[Mikhaylov on Moscow International]* 27
Territorial Issue Still Dogs Ties With Japan *[IZVESTIYA 18 Nov]* 27
Japanese Spokesman on Creating New Ties *[Moscow International]* 29
Rogachev, Japanese Delegation Discuss Ties *[TASS]* 29
Mongolian Defense Minister on Armed Forces Cuts *[Moscow International]* 29

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Interviewed on Cambodian Issue *[Moscow International]* 29
Commentaries on UN Resolution on Cambodia 31
'Weak Points' of Document *[Schedrov on Moscow International]* 31
Formula Called 'Wrong' *[Nikolayev on Moscow International]* 31
U.S. 'Pressing' Philippines on Military Bases *[Moscow International]* 32

Near East & South Asia

Reaction to Death of Lebanese President 32
TASS Reports Death 32
Implementation of Al-Ta'if Accords Urged *[Kuvaldin on TASS]* 32
Foreign Ministry Statement *[TASS]* 32
Supreme Soviet Sends Condolences *[TASS]* 33
Soviet Relations With Israel Seen Changing *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 46]* 33

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Namibia *[TASS]* 34

East Europe

Reportage on Visit by Polish Premier Mazowiecki 35
Greeted by Ryzhkov on Arrival *[TASS]* 35
Ryzhkov Makes Statement *[Warsaw PAP]* 35
Begins Talks With Ryzhkov *[TASS]* 36
Lays Wreath at Tomb of Unknown Soldier *[TASS]* 36
Mazowiecki Interviewed Prior to USSR Visit *[TASS]* 36
Profiled by PRAVDA *[23 Nov]* 37
Polish Ambassador Arrives in Moscow 21 Nov *[IZVESTIYA 23 Nov]* 38
Polish Government Denounces Lenin Monument Attack *[TASS]* 38
Reportage on CSSR Unrest, Government Reaction 38
Government Said Ready for Dialogue *[IZVESTIYA 23 Nov]* 38
Prague CPCZ, Adamec Appeal for Calm *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 39
Students Seek Worker Support for Strike *[IZVESTIYA 24 Nov]* 39
Jakes Sees Need for Reforms *[TASS]* 40
TASS on 23 Nov Protest, CPCZ Plenum 40
'Crisis of Confidence' in CSSR Leaders *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 41
CPCZ's Jakes, Socialist Leader Meet *[TASS]* 41
Dubcek Warns Rally Against Extremism *[TASS]* 42
CPCZ Central Committee Session Opens *[TASS]* 42
Czechoslovak Army Supports CPCZ Policy *[Moscow Radio]* 42
Paper Condemns 1968 Invasion of Czechoslovakia *[Vienna ORF]* 43

CSSR Foreign Minister Receives Soviet Envoy *[Prague Radio]* 43
Gorbachev 'Adviser' Cited on CSSR, GDR *[Belgrade TANJUG]* 43
Krenz Says SED Willing To Give Up Leading Role *[TASS]* 43
SED Commission To Investigate Honecker *[TASS]* 44
GDR's Modrow Cited on Kohl-Krenz Talks *[TASS]* 44
Vorotnikov Continues Visit to Romania 44
Meets With Ceausescu *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 44
Addresses Romanian Friendship Rally *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 44
Ceausescu Report at RCP Congress Viewed *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 46
Ceausescu Statement Not 'Claim' on Moldavia *[Kornilov on TASS]* 49
Central Committee Greets Romanian Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Bulgaria Eliminating Trappings of Zhivkov 'Cult' *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 50

West Europe

Gorbachev, Mitterrand To Hold Talks 6 Dec *[TASS]* 50
Minister Yazov Concludes Visit to Austria 50
Received by Chancellor Vranitsky *[TASS]* 50
Visits Austrian Army Regiment *[TASS]* 50
More on Activities, Remarks *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 51
Meets Waldheim, Commemorates Soldiers *[TASS]* 51
Meets Warsaw Pact Talks Delegations *[TASS]* 51
On Role of Red Army *[Vienna WIENER ZEITUNG 23 Nov]* 51
Says Army Stabilizing Factor in Europe *[Vienna DER STANDARD 23 Nov]* 52
Ends Visit, Departs for Home *[TASS]* 52
FRG's Johannes Rau Arrives in Moscow 52
Met by Vlasov *[Hamburg DPA]* 52
Discusses Trade Ties With Katushev *[Hamburg DPA]* 53
Abalkin Heads Economic Delegation to Brussels *[TASS]* 53
Meets With EC's Delors *[TASS]* 53
Talks to Press After Seminar *[TASS]* 53
Shevardnadze Receives French Ambassador 23 Nov *[TASS]* 54

Latin America & Caribbean

Official Denies Arms Sent to El Salvador Rebels *[Panama City ACAN]* 54

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

21 Nov Supreme Soviet Addresses 55
Primakov Speech *[Moscow TV]* 55
Konev Speech *[Moscow TV]* 57
Stankevich Speech *[Moscow TV]* 57
Gryazin Speech *[Moscow TV]* 58
Gubenko Speech *[Moscow TV]* 58
Boyars' Speech *[Moscow TV]* 60
Proposals on Draft Ownership Law 21 Nov *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Nov]* 60
Moscow TV Airs 22 November Supreme Soviet Session 60
1600 GMT 60
1653 GMT 61
1800 GMT 62
1839 GMT 62
2005 GMT 63
2049 GMT 64
2139 GMT 65
Further on 22 Nov Supreme Soviet Session 65
On Leaseholding, Land Bills *[TASS]* 65
Sobchak on Lease-Contracting *[Moscow TV]* 66
Moscow TV Airs 23 November Supreme Soviet Session 67

1600 GMT 67
1641 GMT 68
1744 GMT 68
1829 GMT 69
1906 GMT 70
2030 GMT 71
2143 GMT 72
Further on 23 Nov Supreme Soviet Session 72
Lukyanov Chairs Session *[TASS]* 72
Adopts Leasing Law *[TASS]* 72
23 Nov Supreme Soviet Addresses 73
Shcherbak Speech *[Moscow TV]* 73
Ivanov Speech *[Moscow TV]* 74
Doguzhiyev Speech *[Moscow TV]* 74
Sahkarov Speech *[Moscow TV]* 75
Gorbachev Chairs Supreme Soviet Session 24 Nov *[TASS]* 76
Gorbachev on Baltics Draft Law *[Moscow Radio]* 76
More on Baltic Autonomy *[Moscow Radio]* 77
Lithuanian Official Explains Walkout *[Vilnius Radio]* 77
Declaration on Forcible Resettlement *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Nov]* 78

Political & Social

Politburo Discusses Results of Student Forum *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 78
CPSU Central Committee Meets 22 Nov *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 79
Gorbachev Addresses Secretaries *[TASS]* 79
Prokofyev, Zaykov Hold News Conference 22 Nov *[Moscow Radio]* 80
Further on Prokofyev Remarks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Nov]* 80
Correction to Prokofyev Speech at Moscow Plenum *[TASS]* 81
'Stormy' Debate Precedes Leningrad Joint Plenum *[IZVESTIYA 22 Nov]* 82
Gidaspov To Head Gorkom *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Nov]* 82
Plenum Adopts Action Program *[TASS]* 83
Rally Supports Party Platform *[Moscow TV]* 84
Leningrad Party Chief Warns of Impending Chaos *[AFP]* 84
Shevardnadze Sees Politics, Ecology Unity *[TASS]* 85
Continuing Vorkuta Strike Situation Reported *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 85
Vorgashorskiy Mine Still on Strike *[TASS]* 86
Coal Output Increases *[TASS]* 86
Pit Strike Update *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Nov]* 87
W. Ukrainian Miners Oust Trade Union Committees *[TASS]* 87
Situation in NKAO, U.S. Resolution Reported *[Yerevan Radio]* 88
Armenians Reject Condemnation of U.S. Resolution *[Yerevan Radio]* 88
Deputies Issue Declaration *[Yerevan International]* 88
Mkrtchyan Criticizes Soviet Reaction *[Yerevan International]* 89
Armenian Rally Condemns Reaction *[Yerevan International]* 89
Lizichev Visits Armenia, Meets Reporters *[Yerevan Radio]* 89
Armenian Party Discusses 1990 Draft Economic Plan *[Yerevan Radio]* 90
Azerbaijan To Publish Draft Constitutional Bills *[Baku Radio]* 90
Officials Decry 'Azerbaijanization' of NKAO *[Yerevan Radio]* 90
Ryzhkov Cited on Quake Zone Restoration *[Yerevan Radio]* 91
Correction to 'Azerbaijan Upgrades Relations' *[Baku Radio]* 91
Moldavian Supreme Soviet Session Agenda Viewed *[PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 91
Supreme Soviet Discusses Elections *[Moscow Radio]* 91
Debate on Ratifying Prosecutor *[PRAVDA 23 Nov]* 91
Estonia Keeps Residence Requirement for Candidates *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 92
Estonian Parliament Debate on 1940 Events Detailed *[IZVESTIYA 16 Nov]* 92
Estonian Parliament Hears Proposal on Article 6 *[PRAVDA 14 Nov]* 93
Lithuania Adopts Ethnic Minorities Law *[TASS]* 93
Lithuanian Party Secretary on Upcoming Congress *[TASS]* 93
Vilnius Military Commander Discusses Parade *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 4 Nov]* 94
Norilsk Gas Supplies Normalize After Explosion *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Nov]* 95

ARGUMENTY I FAKTY Editors on Criticism *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 46]* 95
Editor Starkov Interviewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 22 Nov]* 97
RSFSR Supreme Soviet To Convene 28 Nov *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Nov]* 98
Union Republics Department Described *[TASS]* 99
Ryzhkov Discusses Economic Management Draft *[Moscow International]* 99
Secretary Yakovlev on Perestroyka, Initiative *[PRAVDA 24 Nov]* 100
CPSU Nomenklatura Seen Coming to End *[Warsaw ZYCIE PARTII 15 Nov]* 101
New Culture Minister Discusses Plans *[TASS]* 102
Lukyanov Chairs Meeting on Organized Crime *[PRAVDA 18 Nov]* 102
Biryukova Attends Women's Committee Plenum *[Moscow TV]* 103
Usmanov Visits Ryazan Oblast, Tours Farms *[Moscow Radio]* 103
Central Committee Magazine Published *[TASS]* 103
New Rules for Business Travel Explained *[IZVESTIYA 2 Nov]* 104

Economic

Prosecutor's Office Discusses Economic Crime *[IZVESTIYA 27 Oct]* 105

TRUD Cites Chervov on Armed Forces Cuts

AU2411110689 Paris AFP in English 0948 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 24 (AFP)—The number of Soviet troops has been cut by 235,000 since President Mikhail Gorbachev announced his unilateral force reduction measures in New York last December, TRUD newspaper reported here Friday, quoting General Nikolay Chervov.

In his speech before the United Nations, Mr. Gorbachev had announced a half-million troop reduction over two years.

In addition, 172,000 conscripts who interrupted their studies have been demobed [demobilized] early in accordance with a parliamentary resolution, the head of the Soviet Armed Forces General Staff Directorate said.

Of the 10,000 tanks due to be scrapped in 1989-1990, 7,120 have already been decommissioned, along with 3,000 of the 8,500 artillery pieces and 735 of the 820 military planes due for destruction, the general said.

In the nuclear weapons field some 500 warheads will have been withdrawn from allied socialist countries by the end of the year, including 166 bombs, 284 missiles and 50 artillery shells, the general said.

All nuclear-armed submarines in the Baltic will be decommissioned by the end of 1990 and their weapons destroyed, in line with an announcement made last month by Mr. Gorbachev during his trip to Helsinki.

By the end of next year, two industrial reactors manufacturing weapons-grade plutonium will be closed, in line with an announcement by Mr. Gorbachev in London last April.

In the Leningrad military region tank forces have been cut by half, while Soviet armed forces in the northwest of the country, including the Baltic republics, will be cut back to 40,000 troops and 1,200 tanks in 1991, Gen. Chervov added.

The defence budget is also to be reduced by 14 percent over two years, including 8 percent for this year, he noted.

Chervov Wants CSCE Talks to Include Naval Forces

LD2411115389 Moscow TASS in English 1139 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—The Soviet Union believes that naval armed forces should be included in the Vienna talks on confidence and security, according to a high-ranking Soviet Army official.

The Soviet delegation has again informed the negotiating sides about the Soviet position on the issue, Colonel General Nikolay Chervov, Soviet General Staff Department head, told TASS.

He characterised the talks as constructive and business-like, but said that the Warsaw Treaty and NATO were still divided on several issues.

The Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact member-countries want confidence-building measures to cover the army and the air forces and the navy in Europe and surrounding seas, Chervov said.

The Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies support the introduction of limitations on the scope, intensity and length of military exercises for these armed services and effective verification procedures.

Socialist countries specified working documents' provisions on notification about air forces and naval activities, the monitoring of air forces activities, reduction of extensive military actions, data exchanges about the Army, Air Force and Navy and programmes for the adoption of new types of weapons and hardware, Chervov said.

NATO proposals boil down to more data exchanges about the army and land-based aviation, types of their organisation, sites, and personnel and major types of weapons and hardware numbers, he said.

The proposals reveal NATO's one-sided and imbalanced approach to confidence-building measures and its desire to share data only about the Army.

Naval confidence-building measures and verification become increasingly important with the onset of disarmament, Chervov emphasised.

NATO's Galvin on Arms Control, Soviet Reforms

LD2311234589 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Rome November 22 TASS—The 13th seminar on NATO economies and new East-West relations sponsored by the Italian Atlantic Committee was held on San Giorgio Island in the Venetian lagoon.

It was attended by statesmen, politicians, military officers, scientists, economists and journalists from NATO member countries. They analysed changes in the international arena, prospects for disarmament and the progress of reforms in Eastern Europe.

General John Galvin, supreme allied commander in Europe, addressed the seminar. Citing the USSR as the strongest military power in the world, he called for belief in the Soviet leadership's actions. He also supported the Vienna talks on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe and expressed confidence that they would be crowned with an agreement.

Galvin noted that the Soviet Union is reducing its armed forces but insisted that the reductions should be done more dynamically and on a larger scale.

Addressing a possible [words indistinct] general, who is also commander of U.S. Armed Forces in Europe, said that the time is not ripe for this.

However, he suggested that U.S. reductions could take place if the Soviet Union makes considerable troop cuts in East European countries and if expected agreements on conventional arms cuts are realised. The general was also confident that NATO has a long future.

Senator Mariano Rumor, chairman of the Italian Atlantic Committee, said that breathtaking events are taking place in Eastern Europe. Under these conditions the Western countries should not be just onlookers.

The West should take on the economic challenge and give assistance to Eastern European countries which have embarked on sweeping reforms.

Taking into account developments in the East, NATO should expand the peace dialogue on a pan-European scale, Italian Deputy Foreign Minister Claudio Vitalone said.

Traditional calls for "vigilance" in the face of a mythical "threat from the East" are also voiced on San Giorgio Island. Attempts are being made to paint NATO as the main guarantor of the West's security.

However, most seminar participants favour the development and strengthening of the East-West dialogue.

Disarmament Discussed at Munich Symposium

USSR Arms Negotiator Speaks

LD2111125589 Hamburg DPA in German 1135 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Munich (DPA)—According to Ambassador Richard Burt, head of the U.S. delegation at the Geneva START [Strategic Arms Reduction Talks] negotiations, arms control presents possibilities for a more efficient rearmament and weapons modernization. "Rearmament and arms control should go hand in hand", Burt stated today at the "Franz Josef Strauss Symposium" of the Hanns-Seidel Foundation, which is close to the Christian Social Union, in Munich. Arms control should not be "a substitute for defense policies and for the necessary substitute armaments".

Burt cited as an example an improvement in the early warning system. Especially in face of the current changes in the East "no experiments with military strategies" should be made. [passage omitted]

The head of the Soviet delegation in Geneva, Ambassador Yuriy Nazarkin, emphasized that nonmilitary factors would become increasingly important for security in the world. Attention is increasingly shifting to people's common problems, such as poverty, sickness, the environment, drugs, and terrorism. "We are leaving the age of the Cold War behind us", the Moscow diplomat emphasized. There can be "no artificial, ideological barriers" any longer. "Security through disarmament", is the maxim for a graduated plan with the aim of a world without nuclear weapons.

NATO, U.S., Soviet Officials Cited

LD2411033189 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Bonn November 22 TASS—By TASS correspondent Lev Volnukhin:

There are favourable prospects for achieving specific arrangements on further practical steps in arms reduction next year, said participants in an international symposium in Munich convened by Hans Seidel Foundation which is close to the Christian Social Union (CSU).

The symposium was attended by politicians, military leaders, and political scientists from West Germany, the Soviet Union, the United States and other countries.

Among the participants were NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner, and Yuriy Nazarkin and Richard Burt, USSR and U.S. chief negotiators at the talks on nuclear and space arms.

They discussed topical problems of security, arms control and disarmament in the context of perestroyka processes in socialist countries.

NATO has no fear of changes in the East, nor does it stand in their way, Woerner said.

The success of the policy of glasnost and perestroyka suits the alliance's interests, he noted.

East-West confrontation should be gradually replaced with elements of cooperation, Woerner said. At the same time he declared that the North Atlantic Alliance is irreplaceable in the foreseeable future.

He said that NATO policy in disarmament is the ensurance of maximum deterrence with minimum armaments.

Describing NATO as a source of stability, Woerner, defying logic, attributed not only present positive changes in the international situation to the alliance but also the transformations in socialist countries. He claimed that there would have been neither perestroyka nor glasnost, if it were not for NATO.

Richard Burt, U.S. chief negotiator at Geneva talks on nuclear and space arms, said that considerable progress had been achieved in Geneva and that a treaty on strategic offensive arms reductions was starting to take shape.

At the same time he noted that it is necessary to resolve some fundamental problems, for instance, those of cruise missiles and verification methods.

At the same time Burt declared that arms control cannot replace a policy based on defence and arms modernisation.

He asserted that rearmament and arms control should go hand-in-hand.

Yuriy Nazarkin, head of the Soviet delegation to the Geneva talks, pointed to positive tendencies in the development of East-West relations, to the increase of the role of non-military factors of international security and to the importance of enlisting efforts of the world community to resolve global problems.

In this connection he called the attention of the participants in the forum to the Soviet plan to rid humanity of nuclear weapons stage-by-stage.

Warsaw Pact Defense Ministers To Meet Late Nov

LD1711172689 Moscow TASS in English 1720 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS—The Defence Ministers Committee of the Warsaw Treaty will hold a regular meeting in Budapest in the second half of November 1989.

The committee will discuss ways of further perfecting the joint armed forces with the emphasis laid on the defensive military doctrine of the Warsaw Treaty member states.

Communists' Role in Time of Reforms Viewed

PM2011150389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Conference Held"]

[Text] An international scientific conference on problems of the activity of ruling communist and workers parties in conditions of restructuring and the renewal of socialism was held 14-15 November at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences Institute for the Exchange of Experience of Socialist Building. In addition to Soviet social scientists, the participants in the conference included scientists from the Hungarian Republic, the SRV, the GDR, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, and the CSSR.

There was an exchange of opinions on current questions of the evolution of the sociopolitical situation in the socialist countries and ways to ensure the Marxist-Leninist parties' leading, vanguard role at the stage of profound economic and political reforms, when the diversity of social interests is increasing, the process of the politicization of the masses is in evidence, and alternative social and political organizations and movements are emerging. It was noted that priority must be given to restructuring and the democratization of the Marxist parties as the essential precondition for the successful renewal of socialist society; the need to rethink certain theoretical ideas about socialism and the correlation between the economy and politics was stated; and the idea was stressed that party leadership consists of influencing by political means the development of the different spheres of social life within the framework of the democratic institutions of a rule-of-law state.

CPCZ's Fojtik, DPRK Envoy Visit PRAVDA

PM2311151589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Meetings at the Editorial Office"]

[Text] A meeting was held at the PRAVDA editorial office with J. Fojtik, member of the Presidium and secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee. He noted that PRAVDA is popular in the CSSR and expressed a wish that Soviet people could form a fuller idea of the life of Czechoslovakia's working people from its materials, and closer cooperation between PRAVDA and RUDE PRAVO could play an important role here.

It was stressed that PRAVDA staffers are today fully determined to give their newspaper new dynamism and substantially broaden the range of topics it covers in the light of its readers' interests.

The PRAVDA editorial office was also visited by Kwon Hui-kyong, DPRK ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the USSR. During his meeting with the editorial office leadership opinions were exchanged on the activity of the CPSU and the Workers Party of Korea in modern conditions, the development of Soviet-Korean ties, and cooperation between PRAVDA and NODONG SINMUN.

Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 23 Nov

Comments on Bush Speech, Malta Meeting

LD2311161989 Moscow TASS in English 1603 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—The Soviet Union welcomes the call of U.S. President George Bush to use the forthcoming Soviet-American summit for "moving beyond containment, and once and for all ending cold war," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today, commenting on Bush's Thanksgiving address to the nation.

Recent developments prove that the world is entering a new stage, Gerasimov continued. "The invisible walls of suspicion, misunderstanding and miscalculation", mentioned by the president, are coming down as people come to realise the importance of universal human values and moral norms and the need to search for joint ways to resolve civilisation's problems. "In this sense we are in many ways ending the confrontational postwar period of development and passing over to a qualitatively new stage of broad and open cooperation."

Touching upon the forthcoming summit, Gerasimov said that it could give the two sides an opportunity to discuss the European and international situation calmly and find a common approach to urgent problems. "It can be followed by very important practical steps," he said.

Gerasimov pointed out that such a rapprochement was already being felt. The Soviet Union will continue to cut its military spending and take further steps in this direction. The Soviet Union has also noted the U.S. defence secretary's intention to cut military expenditures. Such developments are regarded as normal now. If Malta gives an additional impulse to this process, it will already be a great achievement, Gerasimov said.

Asked about how the forthcoming call of a Soviet naval ship at Malta will coincide with the Malta Parliament's resolution forbidding nuclear weapons on the island, Gerasimov said:

"We know the rules pertaining to calls at Malta ports by foreign naval ships. The call of the Soviet cruiser Slava at the Malta port has been agreed upon with the Malta authorities."

Urges U.S.-USSR Nuclear Test Ban

LD2311162989 Moscow TASS in English 1619 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—The Soviet Government will actively work with the United States to attain a moratorium on all nuclear explosions, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a news briefing here today.

Gennadiy Gerasimov was commenting on U.S. response to the USSR Supreme Soviet's appeal to the U.S. Congress about a moratorium on nuclear explosions and an end to nuclear tests. The appeal reaffirmed Soviet readiness to announce such a moratorium on any day and at any hour on the basis of reciprocity. The Supreme Soviet proposed to discuss the issue at a meeting of the two countries' parliamentarians.

The appeal, Gerasimov pointed out, was brought to the attention of the American side through diplomatic channels and on August 4 handed to the speaker of the House and Robert Byrd, president pro tempore of the Senate, leaders of party factions in the Congress, and chairmen of the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Foreign Relations and Armed Services. Despite these and other measures, no response was made, the Soviet spokesman stressed.

"The leadership of the U.S. Congress, orienting itself to the rigid position of the Republican administration, which does not consider the complete prohibition of tests as a priority goal, is not going to give a positive response to any proposals envisaging such a prohibition," he added.

At the same time, Gerasimov noted, there are forces in the U.S. Congress that propose concluding a treaty on the comprehensive ban of nuclear tests by 1995. Similar proposals are addressed to the administration by many mass organisations. The Soviet spokesman expressed the hope that these proposals will be heeded by the U.S. Administration.

On Launching of U.S. Satellites

LD2311181889 Moscow TASS in English 1804 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—Opening today's briefing, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov read out the statement of the USSR Foreign Ministry on the November 22 assassination of Lebanese President Rene Mu'awwad.

The elimination of the head of state, recently elected to this post on a legitimate, constitutional basis, clearly reveals that these forces are bent on hindering the fledgling process of a peaceful settlement in Lebanon and on plunging the country once again into internecine bloodshed, the document stresses.

The Soviet Union is convinced that Arab states, and above all the Committee of the Three, set up under the all-Arab mandate, will try to prevent the disruption of a political settlement in Lebanon on the basis of the Al-Ta'if accords and continue to assist constructively the restoration of peace and tranquility in that country.

"We expect this visit to further the positive development of Soviet-Polish relations," Gerasimov said about the official visit to the Soviet Union by Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki that begins on Thursday. He briefed the journalists on the visit's programme.

The Soviet Union welcomes the call of U.S. President George Bush to use the forthcoming Soviet-American summit in order to move beyond containment and once

and for all end the Cold War. Gerasimov commented on Bush's Thanksgiving address to the nation.

Recent developments prove that the world is entering a new stage, Gerasimov continued. "The invisible walls of suspicion, misunderstanding and miscalculation," mentioned by the President, are coming down as people come to realise the importance of universal human values and moral norms and the need to search for joint ways to resolve civilisation's problems.

Gerasimov dwelt on the recently concluded agreement enabling several U.S.-made satellites to be launched by the Soviet Union. They will be put into orbit with the help of the Proton booster rocket. Having noted that U.S. authorities have yet to issue a license for the launch of the satellites, the Soviet spokesman expressed the hope that the American side will objectively and unbiasedly consider the favourable possibilities of bilateral interaction in this area.

The contract, signed by American companies Energetics Satellite and Space Commerce (the latter represents the USSR Glavkosmos Space Agency in the U.S.A.), envisages the launching of at least two commercial satellites in late 1990 and probably six more in the future.

Comments on CSSR Travel Curbs

LD2311164389 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—At a briefing here today Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov dwelt on the Czechoslovak Government's decision to impose temporary restrictions on trips to Czechoslovakia by tourists from neighbouring socialist countries.

Referring to explanations given by the Czechoslovak side, Gerasimov said that this decision has been prompted by the considerable increase over the recent months in tourist trips to Czechoslovakia by citizens of Poland, Hungary, the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, most often for the purchases of consumer goods. These trips had negative consequences for Czechoslovakia.

The restrictions apply only to organised tours that last for one or two days.

The restrictions apply to enterprises and organisations only if they organise tourist trips along the lines of trade union, youth or other public organisations.

The imposed restrictions do not apply to trips associated with production, technological work or other such purposes, nor do they apply to business trips related to cooperation in production.

The decision made by the Czechoslovak side is entirely in its competence, the spokesman said. The temporary character of these measures allows for hope that a mutually acceptable solution can be found by common efforts of the parties concerned.

As for the Soviet Union, it is taking additional measures to prevent violations of customs rules by Soviet citizens.

USSR 'Not Interfering' in CSSR

LD2311164989 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1500 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Gennadiy Gerasimov, spokesman of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs, said at today's news conference in Moscow that the Soviet Union is not interfering in the present situation in Czechoslovakia, and considers it to be an internal affair of a friendly socialist country. In this way he reacted to a question by a correspondent of the Hungarian daily NEPSZABADSAG regarding a message which the Soviet Union allegedly sent not long ago to Czechoslovakia in which it appealed to our leadership to soften its attitude toward the opposition. Gennady Gerasimov also stated that no such message existed.

Previews Visit by Poland's Mazowiecki

LD2311151189 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—"We expect the positive development of Soviet-Polish relations to continue after Tadeuz Mazowiecki's visit," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

Commenting on the Polish prime minister's official visit to the USSR, starting on Thursday, the spokesman told journalists that Soviet-Polish talks will begin on the morning of November 24.

In the afternoon the Polish visitor is expected to meet President Mikhail Gorbachev.

On Saturday afternoon, after a final conversation with Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, Mazowiecki is scheduled to give a news conference.

The Polish delegation will visit Zagorsk and Smolensk on Sunday, and travel to Leningrad the following day.

Asked about "blank spots" in history that Mazowiecki recently described in his TASS interview as outstanding problems in Soviet- Polish relations, Gerasimov said:

"These 'blank spots' must be deleted. Poland and our country have had a hard history. It has both good and bad pages."

"Both Poland and ourselves should now look forward and think how to improve relations. Their development is sometimes hindered by efforts to cling to the past. The sooner these issues are resolved, the better," he pointed out.

Gerasimov Urges 'Dialogue' in CSSR

AU2411144789 Paris AFP in English 1443 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 24 (AFP)—Moscow is closely following events in Czechoslovakia which remain, however, "the internal affair of a friendly nation", Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said here Friday.

Speaking of recent statements by Czechoslovak party chief Milos Jakes on the opening of a dialogue in his country, Mr. Gerasimov said Moscow hoped such a dialogue "would develop and will contribute to normalizing the situation".

The events in Czechoslovakia were receiving detailed coverage here from the Soviet mass media, the spokesman also noted.

Perfilyev Cites Crowe on Reduced Military Threat

PM2311150389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent G. Charodeyev report: "End of the Soviet Threat Myth?"]

[Text] USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center—V.P. Perfilyev, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, has addressed a regular briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists. He reported that such an authoritative person as William Crowe, who recently retired as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, declared in Philadelphia that the threat of an East-West military confrontation in Europe is ceasing to be a reality.

"Crowe's opinion that in the future the activity of the U.S. Armed Forces abroad will be considerably limited because of budget considerations and restraining political factors is of interest," the briefing's presenter emphasized. "Such a development of events would undoubtedly be along the lines of the USSR's readiness to reduce its military presence abroad."

The admiral is echoed by Les Aspin, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, who predicts that as of next fiscal year the U.S. military budgets will be determined not with the help of deficit financing but by the "Gorbachev factor."

The Americans have always said that they "judge Soviet behavior not by words but by deeds." And if one of them considers it possible to limit U.S. military appropriations, this means that the myth of the "Soviet military threat" all too obviously does not tally with the real deeds. It is no coincidence that in recent days the U.S. press has carried reports which attest that the U.S. intelligence agency is revising its assessments of the level of Soviet defense spending, including that on strategic nuclear programs. It is high time that this be done—the USSR Supreme Soviet has at last adopted a new state budget in which our country's military spending has been reduced by almost R7 billion. When broken down into subheads, the reductions will inevitably affect a number of arms production programs. So it is a question not of some promises but of quite specific legislative measures. To all appearances, the myth of the "Soviet military threat" does not have much time left to live.

Adamishin Previews Gorbachev's Italy Visit

Views Economic Ties With Italy

LD2211180789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1626 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Nov (TASS)—Italy and the USSR have come to the stage at which the need to draw up a certain balance sheet of their bilateral relations has arisen. Mikhail Gorbachev's forthcoming Italian visit provides a magnificent opportunity for that, as well as for defining the directions for developing relations between the two countries, Ferdinando Salleo, Italy's ambassador to the USSR, said here today. He was speaking at a press conference devoted to Soviet-Italian relations.

The importance of the Soviet leader's forthcoming visit was also stressed by USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Anatoliy Adamishin, who took part in the press conference. He noted the significance of the visit's political aspect, from the viewpoint of the exchange of views on international problems. The agenda for the visit is this: The international situation, European affairs, and bilateral relations.

Italy is an old partner of the USSR, the deputy minister noted. New forms of cooperation, including mixed enterprises, are now developing successfully between them. In the sphere of economic interaction, approximately 20 agreements are being prepared for signing, and work is being completed on a wide range of new and major contracts of great significance for Italy and for the Soviet economy, including an agreement on Fiat's participation in building a new motor vehicle works in Yelabuga. There are also accords concerning a number of other spheres of interaction—in light industry and the agro-industrial complex. At the present time, Anatoliy Adamishin said, "it appears that a very important agreement on cooperation in converting the military industry is planned."

Replying to a question about the composition of the Soviet delegation, the diplomat named Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs; Stepan Sitaryan, chairman of the State Foreign Economic Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers; and Mayor of Moscow Valeriy Saykin. Also going to Italy with the Soviet leaders will be figures from the world of literature, science, the arts, and advisers and experts to the chairman of the country's Supreme Soviet, the CPSU Central Committee and the Foreign Ministry. Naturally,

Anatoliy Adamishin added, the Soviet leader will be accompanied by his wife during his visit to Italy.

A press conference by Mikhail Gorbachev is provided for within the framework of the visit. At this stage it is planned to hold it on the last day of the visit, 1 December, in Milan.

On Pope Meeting, Uniate Church

LD2211185789 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—The forthcoming meeting between Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and Pope John Paul II will be an exceptionally important event in terms of international politics and the relations between the Soviet Union and the Vatican, a Soviet deputy foreign minister told a news conference here today.

Anatoliy Adamishin said that "if there are no last-minute changes, the meeting will most likely take place on December 1, that is, after the end of Gorbachev's state visit to Italy or, at least, of its official part."

He noted this will be the first meeting at such a high level in the history of the Soviet State.

Adamishin said the dialogue between the Soviet Union and the Vatican "has acquired new dimensions in the past few years" and voiced the opinion that the forthcoming meeting "will raise the dialogue to a new level."

The deputy minister presumed that Gorbachev and the pope "would discuss, above all, the situation in the world on a philosophical, conceptual plane, as well as in its practical aspects."

"I think they will also discuss Soviet-Vatican relations," he added.

Asked about the Uniate Church in the Soviet Union, Adamishin said the attitude to religion in this country "is determined by Soviet laws which proclaim the equality of both believers and non-believers."

He described the problem of Uniates as "difficult".

"Relations between the Catholic Church and the Russian Orthodox Church play a large role in this situation, but there is also the state aspect, which will be considered on the basis of Soviet laws."

Adamishin noted that "Uniates now de facto enjoy all the rights that other churches do."

Speaking about outstanding issues in Soviet-Vatican relations, the deputy minister mentioned "the discrepancy of the boundaries of the Catholic Church's religious districts in the Soviet Union with the internal geographic and administrative division and with Soviet state borders."

Asked about a possibility of inviting the pope to the Soviet Union, Adamishin said "this is an issue that will depend on the two leaders."

Gremitskikh on Efforts To Form Lebanon Government

LD2211152289 Moscow TASS in English 1439 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—The Soviet Union follows with attention efforts aimed at creating a national unity government in Lebanon, which is being formed by prominent Lebanese politician Salim al-Huss, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a news briefing here today.

The Soviet Union believes that the earliest creation of a Lebanese Government, in line with the national accord charter, would mark another major step towards Lebanese settlement and would significantly strengthen the positive processes initiated by the agreements reached at the Al-Ta'if meeting.

Shevardnadze Briefs Deputies on Foreign Policy

PM2411110389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Aleksandr Lyutyy "Political Diary" article: "Diplomacy and Democracy"]

[Text] When he recently mounted the rostrum to deliver a report on our state's foreign policy activity to the USSR Supreme Soviet session, Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze joked that he was tempted to address those present as "Ladies and Gentlemen," seeing that he must speak rather too often abroad and rather too rarely at home.

A joke is a joke, but last year our Foreign Ministry's leaders really were more eager to have more frequent meetings with foreign correspondents than with their own country's public.

Perestroyka and the process of creating a democratic mechanism of power in the country are gradually demolishing this tradition of the lamentable past and bringing back the Leninist practice of the first years of the republic's existence, when the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs submitted its annual reports to the Congress of Soviets. Accountability of foreign policy to the people's chosen plenipotentiaries offers a weighty guarantee that this policy will be in the interests of the state and makes it possible to avoid mistakes.

In this light, last Friday's enlarged sitting of the Supreme Soviet's International Affairs Committee in which E.A. Shevardnadze took part can be considered one more landmark. The minister delivered a foreign policy review and replied to deputies' questions—a very necessary procedure, a procedure that has become a long-established tradition in many states' parliaments. Now it is finally becoming part of our legislative organ's practice. Here is my main impression from the hearings: An

atmosphere of mutual respect, responsibility, and at the same time of exactingness. The conversation was emotional at times, but without excessive tutelage or desire to wound anyone. It emerged that the participants in the dialogue were equally interested in ensuring that our diplomacy ceases to be the preserve of secrecy and becomes as open as possible, and therefore democratic.

A few words about the essence of the questions that were asked. They were numerous. For example, what was the U.S. Congress' response to the address sent to it by the Supreme Soviet on questions of a moratorium on nuclear explosions and cessation of nuclear tests? The address, the speaker explained, was presented to the leadership of Congress in Washington back in early August, immediately following its adoption by the Supreme Soviet. But so far there has been no serious and specific response. Let us wait for an answer. Be that as it may, our line remains firm: movement toward cessation of nuclear tests, conclusion of an appropriate treaty.

The question of Japan's claims to the "Northern Territories" was raised. The minister remarked that there are neither juridical nor historical grounds for redrawing the borders and handing over the southern part of the Kuril Islands. But we are not against the creation of joint ventures in these regions or the development of other forms of joint enterprise.

Replying to questions, the speaker announced the sums received by the Soviet Union on credit from Western banks in the past few years and the amount of our aid to the developing world. He recognized that it is necessary for the diplomatic department to be more actively involved in foreign economic activity.

There was a question about ways to step up union republics' participation in the implementation of our state's foreign policy. The minister said that the number of specialists from union republics in the diplomatic corps is rising. But so far, he admitted, the balance in this regard is adverse.

Do you believe, deputies asked, that the Supreme Soviet must participate in the process of confirming ambassadors? On the whole, the leader of the Foreign Ministry expressed a positive attitude toward this idea.

There were other questions as well. On the whole, the hearings showed that quite sound traditions of collaboration between the foreign policy department and the Supreme Soviet are taking shape. The ministry has set up a special subdivision for such contacts and is collecting interesting ideas from people's deputies. A. Dzasokhov, acting chairman of the Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, said during the conversation that, as far as he could judge from his own experience, the present forms of cooperation with the Foreign Ministry are in sharp contrast with past practices. In my view, the deputy emphasized, an understanding of parliament's proper role is being formed quite actively in our state departments.

Building of 'Common European Home' Progressing

PM2011143189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[Article by S. Karaganov, deputy director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Europe, under the rubric "Platform for Debate": "Laying the Foundation: How the Common European Home Is Being Built"]

[Text] The term Europe as a common home was first heard 4 years ago during M.S. Gorbachev's visit to France at the beginning of October 1985. Since then this idea has been reinforced and is being transformed into a concept for the development of our continent and a European security system.

Whereas initially the idea of the common European home was greeted with skepticism in many political circles, now it enjoys almost universal support. In the West it has invigorated the discussions that have played a perceptible role in the move away from many of the old postulates. It has already been of considerable help to us and has helped draw attention to Soviet European policy, increased confidence in it, and served as a catalyst for its activation. The concept enshrined in this idea of the common destinies of the peoples and countries linked by geography, culture, and history and finally by a system of security helped us seek and find compromises with our partners. It was in Europe that the concept of the balance of interests actually began to work. The level of the military threat and the character of the other challenges to our security were realistically assessed.

This made it possible to take bold steps in the disarmament sphere, to reduce somewhat the importance of the military factor in European politics, and to prepare the ground for tackling seriously the really urgent problems we are now facing and will face in the future—scientific and technical, economic, and environmental problems—and the standard and quality of the people's life. These problems are virtually insoluble if the present level of military confrontation in Europe is maintained.

A realistic understanding of the threats and challenges in the military political sphere made it possible to achieve a breakthrough in nuclear disarmament, take specific measures to reduce conventional forces, put forward radical proposals at the Vienna talks, and move forward in the sphere of military openness.

The change of approach in the sphere traditionally known as humanitarian but now more accurately called the human dimension was also of great significance. The success of the Vienna meeting of representatives of the CSCE states and the processes of the democratization and humanization of society begun in our country dealt perhaps an even more powerful blow to mutual distrust than the measures in the disarmament sphere. After all, the fear of the "Soviet threat" grew not only or not so much from evaluations of the country's military potential as from apprehensions about Soviet society and a

failure to understand it. The change in the USSR's domestic policy and in its image in the world's eyes strengthened our state's security: Western militarist circles found it more difficult to mobilize resources and public opinion for the pursuit of a policy of pressure and confrontation. The question of how to justify reproduction of the system of confrontation and the old level of military activity in the new conditions became a very real one for these circles. Their influence began to wane perceptibly. The growth of military spending slowed down and, in a number of countries, that spending was reduced.

The new Soviet policy had other substantial results. Relations with virtually all the leading Western countries improved while in European politics a qualitatively new political atmosphere appeared that made it possible to examine and resolve practically all the questions that arise in a spirit of partnership and thus more effectively.

About 18 months ago a consensus formed among the main political forces in Western Europe with regard to perestroyka. There was a general understanding of the need and desirability if not of directly helping it, then at least of creating a favorable external environment for it and preventing destabilization of the situation during the changes taking place in the USSR, a number of Eastern European states, and the Warsaw Pact. Western politicians are speaking openly about the undesirability of the development of separatist tendencies in the USSR and the withdrawal of individual countries from the Warsaw Pact. This can only have a sobering effect on many radicals.

Of course, the line of stabilizing changes to which the West is adhering is wholly conducive to providing the external conditions for the course of fundamental reforms and the renewal of socialism in our country and corresponds to our interests.

It is of no small significance that after long hesitation even Washington joined this consensus once it had realistically assessed its own interests and the danger of aggravating disagreements with its allies. The breakthrough in U.S. policy, which happened in May this year, was reflected in official statements, a readiness to delay the decision to modernize its tactical nuclear missiles, and the promotion at the Vienna talks of proposals which in many respects coincide with the positions of the Warsaw Pact. There are positive changes in other areas of U.S. policy, too.

As a result, the Soviet Union was able to significantly reduce the acuteness of the military threat. Despite the arsenals that still exist, that threat is now probably smaller than at any time in our entire history.

One can only rejoice at all these favorable changes. But if these improvements are evaluated in a balanced way, the conclusion will be that we still face quite a few difficult problems in European politics. Progress has been achieved primarily thanks to the removal of the conceptual and ideological rubble of the past. To use a house-building metaphor, we have cleared the construction site, reinforced some of the old foundations, and laid some new ones. But the building of the common European home itself and of a new, more humane, and demilitarized system of security for Europe is only just beginning.

Politically speaking, the situation is favorable but there are forces in the West that do not want to go so far as to make the process of demilitarizing European politics irreversible. In our country, too, there is more than one view on disarmament. There is a certain concern here, it seems to me, which to a large extent feeds on the fact that unilateral reductions are being conducted in a not entirely rational way. Instead of using them to strengthen the professional stratum in the Armed Forces and to reform them, the forces are losing experienced officers capable of doing quite a lot more to strengthen their combat readiness. The human factor continues to be underrated. Weapons systems change every 10 years, but a good specialist is useful for several decades, not to mention the fact that a man will not want to become a specialist if he is unsure of his future.

In the trade and economic sphere, the normalization of relations between many CEMA and EEC member countries and the Western readiness to grant extra credits are accompanied not by an expansion of trade, but by a reduction in it. Our internal base is the deterrent here: The state of the economy is complex. In the West there are doubts that the USSR and a number of other Eastern European states will become particularly promising markets in the near future, and this weakens the position of those who consider it necessary to reduce discriminatory restrictions on trade. Such a reduction may not promise Western companies great benefits.

We are clearly lagging behind in the humanitarian legal sphere. As was noted during recent hearings of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee, our country may not manage to bring its legislation into line with the commitments adopted at the Vienna meeting of CSCE states. This may increase criticism of the USSR in the West and strengthen the position of those who are opposed to the continuation of the development of positive trends in European politics and who want to weaken the USSR's prestige and position.

Here, too, the internal situation is holding us back in a most direct sense: There are so many extremely complex problems here that the Supreme Soviet does not have the time to examine the relevant laws.

Nor can one fail to see that in European politics processes have begun to appear that cannot be regarded in an entirely unambiguous way. The contradictions in a number of Eastern European states that were latent for many years have now surfaced. Some of them have already taken the path of reform and change while others are now doing so. The changes themselves are objective

in character and serve to resolve the contradictions. But rapid changes always contain potential for instability and unpredictability and are capable of causing a weakening of the existing security systems even before the new ones have replaced them.

One should also keep in mind the fact that despite our country's unprecedentedly high standing, some of the parameters of its influence in Europe may, I think, become relatively weaker. In part this is an objective process. It is also characteristic of the position of the other major country, the United States, and is connected with the erosion of what political scientists call the rigid bipolar confrontation and with the diminution of the role of the military factor in world politics and, in particular, in European politics. In part this process of the rearrangement of influence is due to our continuing economic, scientific, and technical lag.

Of course, this possible weakening of influence does not signify the appearance of additional security challenges or the deterioration of the USSR's foreign policy position. But it does demand even greater attention to the strengthening of the political foundations of general European security.

It seems to me that Soviet European policy has reached a certain point. Quite a lot has been done, many problems have been unraveled, and a powerful positive momentum has built up enabling us to take our bearings and prepare a direct policy for building the common European home.

This is no easy task. The pace of change in Europe is increasing. What is needed is not just an adequate response but a priority anticipatory strategy based on the most accurate possible prediction of the development of the situation in Europe and the world.

The immediate task, clearly, is to consolidate what has been achieved and to put into practice the conceptual breakthroughs that have already occurred in the disarmament and humanitarian spheres. It is necessary to continue the line toward stabilization of the process of changes and the launching of a broad dialogue and collaboration on this question with our partners in the general European process.

CSCE Seminar on Military Doctrines Previewed

PM2311094589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Major General A. Inyakov, deputy chief of a USSR Armed Forces General Staff Directorate, by Colonel V. Nazarenko: "Seminar on Military Doctrines"; date, place not given]

[Text] [Nazarenko] Artur Fedorovich, as is known the real success of the third session of the Vienna talks on confidence- and security-building measures in Europe, in which representatives of 35 countries are participating, was the elaboration of an accord on convening a seminar to discuss and compare military doctrines. Where, when, and at what level has it been decided to hold this seminar?

[Inyakov] This forum will take place in Vienna 16 January through 5 February 1990. Its organizers—the participants in the talks of "the 35" representing the 16 NATO countries, the 7 Warsaw Pact countries, and 12 neutral and nonaligned countries—believe that it is desirable to hold the first seminar on military doctrines at quite a high military-political level. They expressed the hope that delegations headed by the chiefs of the general staffs of the CSCE participant countries will take part in it. Experts at the highest level from among the military and diplomats will also participate in the discussion of doctrines. The seminar program makes it possible to discuss all aspects of military doctrines on equal terms: both military-political and military-technical aspects, with regard to both nuclear weapons and conventional forces used in all spheres of armed struggle.

The decision to hold such an event is of special significance for socialist countries, for they were the first to advance this idea and actively sought its implementation.

[Nazarenko] What is the purpose of the seminar?

[Inyakov] It can be formulated briefly as follows: to remove the mutual suspicion and mistrust which have been building up over the years, to achieve better understanding of each other's intentions, and to take the first real step toward ensuring that military doctrines—above all, those of the Warsaw Pact and NATO and of all the CSCE participant countries—are based only on defensive principles.

The chief thing is to broaden and deepen understanding of the essence of military doctrines and the degree of their realization at the contemporary stage in a constructive spirit on the basis of a free and frank exchange of opinions. And to achieve mutual understanding both in the sphere of conceptual approaches to problems of war and peace and to the norms of states' conduct in the international arena and in the sphere of ascertaining the main areas for future troop and arms reductions.

Comparing military doctrines means analyzing their nature, thrust, further evolution, and structure, the practice of military building, and the activities of armed forces. It cannot be ruled out that other questions connected with ascertaining the sides' military abilities and their potential for realizing them will also be discussed.

[Nazarenko] What do you think, Artur Fedorovich? What might be the subject of detailed discussion at the upcoming seminar?

[Inyakov] Most likely, questions of the military-technical aspect of the doctrines. The point is that this means not only the quantitative and qualitative levels of army and

navy equipment with armaments and military hardware. It includes a wider range of aspects characterizing military building as a sector of human activity.

The seminar participants will probably try to discuss the conceptual basis of the principle of defense sufficiency and its criteria. In my view, there are more questions than answers here.

I believe that common approaches to basic criteria for defense-oriented military structures will be examined, and mutually acceptable models of defensive structures discussed. It is also necessary to formulate common terminology relating to military doctrines.

As you can see, there are many questions. It is hard to say which of them will be resolved at the first seminar. But it is desirable to lay the foundations for further debate at the very first meeting of experts.

[Nazarenko] It evidently will not be possible to avoid talk of military budgets at the seminar.

[Inyakov] Of course. For this is a constituent part of the specific parameters whereby it is possible to judge whether a particular state's doctrine is really defensive.

[Nazarenko] What do you think? Is it possible to build a mutually acceptable model of military alliances' defensive structures without removing tactical nuclear weapons from the general-purpose forces?

[Inyakov] Because of the catastrophic consequences of their use for terrestrial civilization, nuclear weapons have never been and cannot be recognized as a guarantee of peace. Ever since they appeared they have been a source of constant international tension and a mainstay for all sorts of ambitious forces. Nevertheless, defensive structures crammed with nuclear weapons do exist. For many years the world has been living under conditions of their continuous buildup and improvement. We must take this into consideration and create appropriate systems, although we are well aware that with the development of military hardware and growth in the qualitative parameters of weapon delivery systems adherence to nuclear deterrence is becoming increasingly dangerous.

The concept of "nuclear deterrence" is self-perpetuating and stimulates the arms race. Each of the sides seeks to have such means as will give it some advantages—temporary ones, as a rule, for the opposing side also does not sleep.

It is possible to claim in conclusion that it is impossible to create a mutually acceptable model of military alliances' defensive structures without the total destruction (elimination) of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe and in the waters adjacent to it. This means that the existing structures must be placed under strict mutual international control.

[Nazarenko] Will the seminar influence the strategy of accelerating the Vienna talks?

[Inyakov] We are very much counting on this. As practice has shown, it is always easier to eliminate the acuteness of contradictions under conditions of intensive mutual contacts.

Foreign Groups Thanked for GOSR Greetings

PM2411144589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[USSR leadership bodies' message of thanks: "Thanks for Congratulations"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers have received greetings and congratulations from Soviet and foreign citizens, state and public organizations, working people's collectives, and foreign governments and parties in connection with the 72d anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution [GOSR].

In their cables and letters USSR citizens state their support for the course of perestroyka and democratization. These messages reflect the desire of the country's multiethnic population to steadily overcome the deformations, renew socialism, and actually implement economic and political reform. The idea of the need for resolute steps to stabilize the consumer market and reinforce public order and labor discipline was underlined.

The greetings received from abroad confirm the increase in well-disposed interest in the processes of perestroyka taking place in the USSR among leading circles and various strata of the public. The new political thinking and the Soviet Union's specific actions to demilitarize, democratize, and humanize interstate relations were assessed highly.

The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the USSR Council of Ministers thank everyone who sent congratulations on the 72d anniversary of October.

[Signed] CPSU Central Committee
USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers.

United States & Canada

Reaction to Bush Thanksgiving Day Address

Speech Reported

PM2311181989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 24 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Ending the 'Cold War.' Speech by U.S. President"]

[Text] Washington, 23 Nov —U.S. President G. Bush has addressed the country on the national holiday—Thanksgiving. His speech, which was intended as a policy speech on the eve of the forthcoming 2-3 December Mediterranean meeting between the U.S. and Soviet leaders, contained a detailed analysis of U.S. positions on the processes taking place in the countries of East Europe and in the Soviet Union.

"Now we are at the threshold of the 1990's," the President said. "And as we begin the new decade I am reaching out to President Gorbachev and proposing that we jointly remove the last obstacles on the road to a new world of freedom. Let us move beyond the policy of containment and once and for all end the 'cold war.'"

The United States, the head of the U.S. Administration stated, wants President Gorbachev's reforms, known as perestroyka, to succeed. He indicated that the United States is endeavoring to establish a "new partnership" with the Soviet Union and that the reform process being implemented under M.S. Gorbachev's leadership "is creating an unprecedented atmosphere of openness and transformations."

We are 10 days away from the meeting off the coast of Malta, G. Bush continued. I want President Gorbachev to know exactly where the United States stands. "We are not meeting to determine the future of Europe—after all, in the final analysis, the peoples of Europe will determine their own future themselves."

Recalling that this meeting with the Soviet leader will be his first as U.S. President, G. Bush stated: "The meeting will provide an opportunity for analysis and assessment. Now is not the time for detailed arms control negotiations best left for next year's official Soviet-U.S. summit." Justifying this, as he put it, with reference to "the pace of progress dictated by common sense," the President stressed that the current "time of historic change is no time for recklessness." "The peace, and the confidence, and the security of our friends in Europe are all too important," he added.

"Off the coast of Malta," the President stated, "Mikhail Gorbachev and I will be embarking on many years of work... I will tell President Gorbachev, the dynamic architect of Soviet perestroyka, that America wants Soviet people to realize all their plans. And I will assure him that perestroyka has no more ardent supporter than the U.S. President."

After the meeting off the coast of Malta consultations will be held in Brussels with America's NATO partners, the President noted. I can assure the allies that, however radical the changes in East Europe or the Soviet Union may be, the United States will remain in Europe—even if both sides' armed forces are substantially cut—"as long as our friends want it and as long as they need us." "The form of America's role in the new Europe may change," G. Bush stressed, "but not the content." At the same time, the President called for the creation of an atmosphere in Europe which would fundamentally differ from the "difficult, joyless peace between two armed camps which we have known for so long."

Stressing the breadth of the changes in East Europe, G. Bush admitted that between East and West there are still "invisible walls of suspicion, doubt, and misunderstanding." "The scars of a conflict that began half a century ago still divide the continent. That is why the historic task now facing us is to begin healing this old wound."

Concluding his speech, the President said: "It is said that peace is not won in a day and is not the result of any one act. Nonetheless, every constructive step helps to strengthen peace. Every missed opportunity impedes it. Peace will win through ultimately just as a child grows and reaches maturity—slowly—until, one fine day, we realize with tremendous surprise that the child has become an adult. We hope that the Malta meeting, too, will be the kind of constructive step that sends brave pilgrims off to a new world of freedom."

In conversation with a group of journalists shortly before his televised speech President G. Bush stressed: "I'm looking forward to the meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev. We're going to the meeting in a spirit of good will."

Commentary on Need for 'Agenda'

LD2311102189 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Pavel Kuznetsov commentary]

[Text] In his Thanksgiving address to the nation from Camp David, Wednesday night, President Bush hailed the emergence of a new Europe and warned his critics that a time of historic change is no time for recklessness. More on the subject from our observer Pavel Kuznetsov:

World leaders are under enormous pressure to agree on a coherent policy to navigate international relations through the uncharted waters of a new situation brought about by sweeping reforms in Eastern Europe. On Friday, President Bush is to meet with Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Great Britain at Camp David; President Francois Mitterand of France will have talks with the Soviet president in the Ukraine's capital, Kiev next month; Soviet-Polish talks in Moscow are aimed at a new level of understanding; the Soviet-American

summit off the coast of Malta starting early next month will devote substantial time to this particular subject.

These days there is plenty of talk about support for perestroyka and democracy in eastern Europe. The United States and the Soviet Union seem to agree this is no time to revize the existing political and military structures, let alone the postwar borders in Europe. We may see, and rather soon, deep cuts in nuclear and conventional arms and military budgets on both sides. The cold war may be indeed over. This is all fine. What is unsetting in this new situation is an obvious sense of nervousness. Now that the old way of thinking, planning, and conducting foreign policy has crumbled, what is to replace it? How do we define political stability, sought by both sides, what are the guarantees and safeguards? What is to be done about those regions of the world where change is either slow or is yet to come?

In this delicate transition period there has to be an understanding about how to deal with regional conflicts. The Soviet Union is a big supplier of arms, but is it alone in the field? President Bush (?knows) that this is not so. Therefore, instead of accusing the other side of upsetting stability and fanning tensions, Washington and Moscow could once again to try to defuse the issue by setting an example to others, as they did with medium and shorter-range nuclear missiles.

For several years now Mikhail Gorbachev has been calling for a new thinking that would reshape international relations, as if he knew what was coming. Nobody is smiling these days at his words, which proved to be prophetic. We need an agenda, and very soon, to restore our confidence that the world is moving in the right direction and that it will not be reversed.

Analyst Comments

LD2311202289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1255 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 23 Nov—Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

This address by the U.S. President was awaited with great interest and attention. I do not think that I would be wrong if I said that it in many ways strengthens the optimism with which the Soviet and international public are approaching the upcoming Soviet summit on 2-3 December. One can only express sincere satisfaction that on the eve of this meeting the call has sounded out from Washington to "go beyond the framework of the policy of restraint and end the 'cold war' once and for all, and to destroy "the invisible walls of suspicion, the walls of doubt."

"Both sides are united in the fact that their common aim lies in the creation of more stable, constructive and lasting relations—such relations in which openness and interaction are supplanting to an ever greater extent mistrust and rivalry," the joint Soviet-U.S. statement adopted in Wyoming in September stated. Today, we have the right to say that this positive process is continuing, is becoming more stable and deeper and, we hope, is acquiring an irreversible character.

Yes, Soviet-U.S. relations are continuing to develop at the speed of a fast cruiser. I think that such a comparison is quite appropriate if one takes account of the fact that the Moscow- Washington summit dialogue will be continued in the Mediterranean, aboard Soviet and U.S. warships. At the same time, I would be acting against my conscience if I said that we in Moscow no longer see any problems along the path of the transition of Soviet-U.S. relations to the channel of mutual understanding and mutual trust. And it is not just a matter of the presence of a number of serious questions, first of all in the sphere of guaranteeing security and disarmament, which are still to be resolved. That is, of course, the main thing. However, I think the task also lies in totally overcoming the mentorial tone, an old vestige, in which one side sometimes addresses the other.

For example, surprise is aroused by the following passage in President Bush's Thanksgiving Day speech: "In May I set out five steps which President Gorbachev must take if he wants us to take his new thinking seriously: First, he must reduce Soviet forces; second, support self-determination in Eastern Europe; third, cooperate with us in the interest of stopping regional conflicts; fourth, achieve a sound pluralism and respect for human rights; and fifth, unite with us in efforts toward resolving global problems, taking into account the threat created by the spread of drugs."

I will not go into the essence of the "demands" put forward by the U.S. President here, although such an analysis would inevitably give rise to a complete natural question: What bases, exactly, were there in May or are there now to doubt the resolution and readiness of our country for a reduction in arms, the stopping of regional conflicts, or, let us say, for support of those positive changes which are occurring in the countries of Eastern Europe and are directed towards the renewal of socialism? Surely all of this is in the course not only of our new thinking but also of our practical policies today. Let us ask a question of a different order: If the pivotal task, as President Bush speaks of it, is to exceed the framework of the policies of containment and to destroy "the invisible walls of suspicion, the walls of doubts, and the lack of full understanding," is it necessary or appropriate to set one another a kind of "examination of maturity".

I think that putting forward all sorts of conditions, and, even more so, attempts to arrange some sort of "test" for the irreversibility of Soviet perestroyka, and even to seek "assurances" of the continuation of reforms, is today the sort of element which will scarcely promote the development of fruitful and constructive dialogue, fully in accord with the interests not only of the USSR and the United States, but also the interests of the world as a whole. It is quite obvious that the positive moves and changes taking place in our country, in its external and

domestic policies, are serious and long-term ones. This has frequently been pointed out, and with complete justification, by leading politicians of various Western countries, including the United States. These changes have been dictated, by the way, not at all by any striving to "get into tune" with anyone's wishes or "advice"; they are dictated by our convictions, by the demands of life, and by our new political thinking. This is the objective reality on the basis of which, one would think, it is necessary to proceed. I am convinced that it is precisely this approach which would lead more rapidly to the collapse of those "walls of suspicion and doubt" which President Bush speaks about.

IZVESTIYA Reports Bush Interview

PM2311180189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Shalnev report on undated interview in Washington with U.S. President George Bush: "Ahead of Malta. George Bush Answers Questions From IZVESTIYA and Another Nine European, Canadian, and Japanese Publications"]

[Text] Washington—U.S. policy regarding the Soviet Union is based on a wish that the process of perestroyka succeed. U.S. President George Bush stated that in answer to a question asked by your IZVESTIYA correspondent during an interview organized by the White House for a group of foreign journalists especially in connection with the upcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting near Malta.

The question was this: "What agenda are you taking to the meeting? You declared the other day that the meeting will be a historic opportunity to strengthen peace. How do you intend to achieve this? And finally: Would it be correct to say that your administration's policy regarding the Soviet Union is now fully formed? If so, what are its basic principles?"

I will cite the answer in full:

"There is no formal agenda, as there would be at a meeting discussing arms control issues. Arms control will be discussed at the summit which it has already been agreed to hold (the reference is to the accord on M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States in the spring or summer of next year—A.Sh.). That is the first point.

"I want to be sure," the President continued, "that we do not miss an opportunity if it opens up. I want to be sure that we have no misunderstanding: Mr Gorbachev does such and such, but we don't understand what lies at the bottom of his thinking.

"I would not like to use the term 'summit.' That term, at any rate in our country, has an additional connotation—a connotation chiefly presupposing the conclusion of an arms control understanding. At this meeting we are not going to dot all the i's. That won't happen, and I don't think the general secretary believes it will. I hope he doesn't think so. But maybe we should clearly let him know via your newspaper that we don't expect this. However, I don't think there are any such expectations.

"Further, so many rapid changes are now taking place in East Europe that I am very interested in hearing his thoughts about the future of Europe. People know my convictions regarding self-determination. They know my conviction that democracy and freedom are now on the march. I will have an opportunity to reaffirm this conviction and to express to the Soviet leader my concept, my ideas about the future.

"As for U.S.-Soviet relations, at the present stage they are based on our wish to see perestroyka succeed. I think some of our Soviet friends may have had a slight misunderstanding on this score. I think that, on the basis of various statements (made in America—A.Sh.), on the basis of the time it took us to formulate our arms control proposal, or even to determine the date of the summit, or even to put forward the proposal—and it was my proposal—to go to Malta, I think in general there was a slight misunderstanding as to whether we want perestroyka in fact to succeed.

"I remember how last year in New York, at a meeting with President Reagan and myself, Mr Gorbachev said very bluntly that certain elements want perestroyka to fail or are expressing doubts as to whether it will succeed. And I spoke up, although at the time I was just the vice president, and said: Hold it, hold it, no one in the United States seriously wants perestroyka to fail. I'm not sure that he realized that the new administration, while engaging in an unhurried and cautious review and analysis of our defense policy, does indeed think that.

"But you ask me about our relations. I think they are based on our wish for perestroyka to be successful, since what is also bound up with this is the success of what Americans believe in, and they are convinced that freedom and democracy are best of all and that the right to self-determination is the best of all. I cannot conceal the fact: We still have differences between our systems. But our policy is based on respect for what Gorbachev is trying to do. It is in our interests for perestroyka to succeed. If it succeeds, the world, it seems to me, will be far more tranquil for every one of us. Many of us will in fact be able to channel more of our output into helping people than into creating weapons."

That was the answer given by President Bush, who, I must note, was meeting with representatives of the Soviet press for the first time since his inauguration as head of the White House.

But I was not the only one to ask a question about the meeting near Malta. This topic was voiced one way or another in the other journalists' questions, too. But even when it wasn't voiced, the President found an opportunity to turn to it.

In particular, he intimated very clearly that in conversations with the Soviet leader he will be prepared to discuss

all sorts of questions concerning the situation in various parts of the world. We are prepared, he said, to cover "the whole world, not only the changes that are taking place in East Europe and in fact prompted our interest in holding this meeting now. We and the Soviets have many regional problems. We have spoken out frankly on them. They know of our concern about Cuba... We will speak of this. I expect Mr Gorbachev to be very open to such a discussion. We are not going to discuss only what is of more interest to the Soviets." The President remarked that the changes in East Europe have in no way reduced U.S. interests in Asia and that among other things he will be prepared to talk with the Soviet leader about policy regarding the Korean Peninsula.

However, he made a point of stressing that "we will not try to decide anyone's fate. That is not the point of the meeting. It would be a mistake to do that."

I personally gained the impression that the administration is not geared up for concrete results from the forthcoming conversations, although—as you may realize from what the president has said—there is no problem that he will not be prepared to consider in Malta. As a matter of fact the President himself confirmed this supposition toward the end of the interview, pointing out that people in certain countries "are almost in a state of euphoria as regards their expectations" for the Malta meeting. "The euphoric expectations should be moderated... I want the visit (to Malta—A. Sh.) to be successful. My definition of success is if you simply meet together and discuss the changes which are taking place."

The conversation turned to events in East Europe once again. One West European journalist drew attention to the fact that these events were unexpected "even for your administration, and some people in West Europe are disturbed about this." The answer George Bush gave must, I think, be cited in its entirety:

"I do not believe that many people in West Europe are worried by the fact that there have been changes. I believe that some people may be worried about where these events may lead and whether something unforeseen will happen to reverse these changes. My interpretation of public opinion in West Europe is as follows: 'We are very happy that changes are taking place but we are somewhat uncertain about what will happen next. What will happen today? What will happen tomorrow—in a situation where changes are so rapid?'"

"We in the United States," the President continued, "are trying not to heed those people who are urging us on to such graphic actions. We prefer to react in a well-considered and circumspect manner, as befits a great power. You know that I have been criticized for my timidity. I refute these critical statements and consider them 99-percent political intrigue. Nonetheless criticism can still be heard. Some people would even like me to go and prance along the Berlin Wall... But what good would it do for the U.S. President to strike a pose? There is no point in that. That is why we are acting cautiously. As for what role we may play or how we can control the changes, the only thing I can say is that the self-determination, openness, and glasnost which are spreading—and Mr Gorbachev should be given credit for this since he kindled the flame—to countries where there was no glasnost and openness, should be given encouragement, but encouragement that would not, however, provoke violence... Events are developing in our favor, our way. What do I mean by 'our way'? Democracy and freedom. That is why there is no need for us to try to closely control people's desire for change in the East European countries."

"Every country," Bush said, "has its own sovereign rights and every country has the right to determine its future for itself. That is a guiding principle for the United States. It would be a mistake for the United States to try to dictate to a particular country what course it should choose with regard to the Warsaw Pact, the Soviet Union, or anyone else. I do not believe that this is the United States' role. The United States' role is to say: This is what is best from our viewpoint—democracy, freedom, free elections, freedom of the press, freedom of religion."

The conversation turned to the future of NATO. Bush, it seemed to me, was categorical: "NATO's role as an alliance will continue." Then explanations followed: "The levels of military involvement (NATO's—A. Sh.) may change from time to time... A great deal was said at the last NATO meeting about the environment, political reforms, and changes in the rest of the world. The Western alliance poses no threat to anyone. I do not see it becoming a dead letter or outmoded... The alliance is very vigorous."

The prospect of the United States decisively cutting back its military spending was another key topic in the interview. The press is writing about the administration's plans to reduce the Pentagon budget by $180 billion over the next 5 years. Some commentators have described these plans as revolutionary. Here is President Bush's opinion:

"Rapid changes are taking place in the world. I am not saying that we will always have the same levels of armaments everywhere—in Europe, Korea, and anywhere else. But, without doubt, we have no intention of embarking on unilateral actions. We are doing what we are doing in conjunction with our allies. We will, without doubt, be prepared to consider everything anew—we will always be ready to do that... But there will be no what I would describe as premature decisions, if you are talking about unilateral reductions... Some people," the head of the White House developed his idea, "are ready to attach too much significance to reports that the defense secretary (Richard Cheney—A. Sh.) has ordered an analysis to be conducted of what cuts could be made and where."

Then, in response to the question whether the United States will be prepared to limit its military spending and increase economic aid to East European countries and

thus facilitate the reforms taking place there, the President said: "If you are asking whether we may agree to unilateral reductions in order to invest money in the development of East Europe, the answer is no. I am not about to recommend unilateral cuts... We will discuss our legitimate defense requirements with our allies, while taking into consideration the changes taking place in the world... As we understand it, the Soviet Union spends approximately 17 percent of its GNP on defense. That is a vast sum. It is a tremendous burden on an economy which is already experiencing difficulties. We will talk about this with the Soviet leaders. We will try to show them that reduced defense will not harm their security since we have no intention of attacking the Soviet Union. As soon as we can convince them that the West poses no threat to them then, I believe, it will be possible to redistribute resources throughout the world—away from weapons toward aid for others."

Lastly, the prospects for German reunification. What does the White House think about this?

"Let the German people resolve this matter," the U.S. President replied.

...The interview was comparatively short. Many questions were simply left unasked, and not all of the President's answers were totally clear. Some of what he said, and the way he said it, do not entirely coincide with the substance and manner of what some of his closest aides and advisers are saying in these last few days before the Malta meeting. On the other hand, clearly one cannot help but understand George Bush: World events are taking place too rapidly for it to be possible to determine straightway one's position on all aspects of foreign and defense policy.

U.S. Debate on Malta Meeting Viewed

PM2311230189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent V. Linnik report: "Malta Ahoy: What People in the United States Are Thinking and Saying on the Eve of the Summit Meeting"]

[Text] New York—On this day squally winds of incredible force hit New York, flinging rainwater by the bucketful against the window panes. Work on a neighboring construction site stopped. Not a soul stayed on the upper stories of the new skyscraper. A heavy iron ball was attached to the cable of the lofty tower crane for stability. A metaphor suggested itself: The winds of change that are gathering force in the world today are prompting similar precautionary measures in foreign policy.

Safety techniques in storm situations in the international sphere should be observed even more carefully than in industry. It is all the more important not to make sudden movements or shout: "Let the storm rage as wildly as it may!" Today the succession of events generated by the new political thinking is gathering such speed that the thinking itself cannot always keep up. In these conditions the caution that is generally a characteristic of the present American Administration's foreign policy picture turns out to be a blessing. And this applies to its reaction both to events taking place outside our borders, and to those within our own vast territory.

Since the moment that the summit meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders was announced, a cornucopia of advice has poured forth here and scenarios have been proposed with which people try to equip President G. Bush on the eve of his conversations with M.S. Gorbachev. It is universally acknowledged here that meetings between the Soviet and American leaders have enormous political and emotional potential: They can make share prices soar on the stock markets and exert an enormous influence on the development of international events and on world public opinion.

Virtually everyone here was hostile to the administration's initial thesis that the Malta "summit" [in English] (which is what they call a top-level meeting here) is not a "summit" at all, but something in the nature of conversations under the clear Mediterranean moon. Hence the number one recommendation that is heard here: The meeting must be well prepared, with clearly formulated American positions. Thus S. Nunn, chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, stated: "It is necessary to prepare carefully for the meeting and clarify what we want to convey to the Soviet leader and what we want to avoid. We should not go in for ill-thought-out improvisation on the arms control question." The President was given the same advice by T. Foley, speaker of the House of Representatives: "G. Bush should avoid unprepared opinions on such a serious and complex topic as arms reduction."

These warnings are based on the desire to prevent a repetition of Reykjavik, when in the course of the meeting President R. Reagan "got too complacent" and supposedly all but derailed the entire system of Western security by almost agreeing to the destruction of the Soviet and U.S. strategic nuclear arsenals.

It seems that in America's political establishment the debate over how rapid progress should be in the sphere of Soviet and U.S. arms reductions is leading nowhere. The right-wing forces' thesis that there should be no hurry over a treaty on reducing strategic arsenals is patently losing supporters. "In the event of an unfavorable development of events in the USSR or the world," they reason, the Soviet Union, with its political system, will find it "easier to restore the arms programs that were cut" than the Western democracies, which will have to convince public opinion of the need for such a step. A major role in the collapse of this right-wing argument was played by the debate in the USSR Supreme Soviet on establishing a legislative framework for all decisions in the Soviet Union in the sphere of military policy.

R. Perle, the "black prince" among American foreign policy specialists, in a recent issue of the U.S. NEWS

AND WORLD REPORT, adds this advice: There is no need to hurry to conclude a strategic offensive arms agreement because, he says, against the background of economic difficulties in the USSR, the United States could conclude an agreement in a year's time that would be more advantageous to it.

However, what the administration's position amounts to is that treaties should be concluded right now, when the most favorable opportunities for signing them for very many years have developed. This position was formulated not without pressure from the Democrats in Congress, who have long been accusing the White House of slowness in developing Soviet-American dialogue. "Uncertainty about the future," U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker stated on this point, "convinces us still more that the present moment should be used to conclude an agreement." The destruction and reduction of weapons systems now, he believes, will make a change of course in the future extremely costly.

The question of repealing the Jackson-Vanik amendment, whereby a five- or six-fold duty is levied on [illegible] goods on the U.S. market, is placed on the summit agenda by the very course of events. Although it is important to remember that even if it is revoked—as the administration is prepared to do—no "economic miracle" is going to occur. God knows, our export potential is not that big anyway. One can scarcely expect the West to help us work better, improve our discipline, instill a love of order, thrift, and prudence. Only we can do that.

Obviously, the upcoming conversations aboard the warships cannot ignore events in the European socialist countries and in Central America. And the recommendations that the local political oracles are giving to the White House are often not bereft of common sense. At a recent seminar in Atlanta, which was attended by six former U.S. secretaries of state, for example, there were warnings against misinterpreting events in Eastern Europe and against attempts to use them in U.S. interests.

Perhaps it is this kind of advice that indicates most clearly that the thinking of the cold war days, when the "disintegration of the Soviet empire" had been one of the goals of U.S. foreign policy ever since the end of the forties, is being surmounted.

I think that the newspaper is in too much of a hurry with its triumphant announcement of the "funeral of communism"—that was what its editorial called it. We have repeatedly witnessed similar hasty funerals in the past. Certain people here believe that perestroyka should be supported because it marks an evolution of communism toward capitalism. However, they fail to see that our development has quite a different character: It is a movement from a flawed model of socialism to genuine socialism based on the primacy of the individual both in domestic and foreign policy. Therefore if we are going to talk today about the departure of ideology from the sphere of East-West confrontation, it can only be in the context of interstate relations. And rejecting the socialist model of social development from the outset as notoriously flawed and the embodiment of evil would be, at the very least, to delude oneself.

On the threshold of the summit it is pointed out here that the U.S. President's hand consists by no means entirely of trumps. The U.S. deficit—on the order of $3 trillion—continues to grow. The position of the Republicans, that is, the President's party, is far from brilliant. This was confirmed once again by the local elections that have just been held. The party now has fewer seats in Congress and controls a smaller number of governorships than in 1980—on the very eve of the so-called "Reagan revolution." The "great Republican majority" which the Republican strategists promised at the beginning of the decade has not materialized.

In the President's complicated relations with a Congress controlled by the Democrats—where, incidentally, he is increasingly losing—the White House desperately needs actions that will increase its political clout. Today nothing can give the President more pluses than progress in relations with the Soviet Union.

The U.S. Congress and the Executive Branch are now on the point of implementing the Gramm-Rudman amendment. It prescribes an automatic cut in federal spending to reduce the state budget deficit. Pentagon chief D. Cheney has ordered plans to be made for a $180-billion cut in his department's budget over the next 5 years in view of the federal deficit and the "political changes in Eastern Europe."

Japan and the EEC are formidable economic realities with which Washington is increasingly having to reckon. Nor can pressure on the United States from the West Europeans in favor of accords with the Soviet Union be discounted.

Even though its problems are quite different from ours, for the United States they are no less serious. This would seem to be why, on this occasion, there has been no arguing about who benefits more from the summit—the USSR or the United States. The benefit from the ending of the cold war must be mutual.

Finally, a few figures. Some 48 percent of Americans have expressed the belief that the upcoming meeting between the U.S. and Soviet leaders will be successful. Only seven percent think otherwise. This was demonstrated by a national public opinion poll that has just been carried by THE LOS ANGELES TIMES.

This is not a bad sign, one would think.

Western Doubts About Malta Meeting Discounted

PM2211165389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[Anatoliy Karpychev article under the "Commentary of the Day" rubric: "The Advantage of 'Personal Diplomacy'"]

[Text] I was not the person who discovered that the West is inhabited by practical people. I have nothing against this quality (would that we had a little more of it), but I am convinced that not all actions and characteristics can be tailored to the criteria of advantage. That is why I was somewhat surprised by the debate in the Western press as to who benefits—M.S. Gorbachev or G. Bush—from their impending meeting 2-3 December off Malta in the Mediterranean.

It always seemed to me somehow that, starting with Geneva in 1985, the advantage derived from Soviet-U.S. summits has been determined not by a desire for acclaim or a tug-of-war for popularity but by the fact that we are all able to live a little easier in the world since the threat of the nuclear holocaust has been rolled back from the fatal brink by these meetings and goodwill. It is these meetings and all the consequences they entail that purge us of our suspicion and fear for our future and give rise to trust and understanding. If the two leaders have a meeting—albeit an unofficial meeting—without a clear agenda, why should they be suspected of intending to supposedly improve their standing? I may be too categorical, but the Western press articles containing passages like this are equally categorical.

Some foreign newspapers claim that M.S. Gorbachev is allegedly more in need of the meeting since he has great problems—the miners' strike, commodity shortages—at home and that is why he wants to reduce the pitch of these passions using this event in the Mediterranean. You read these lines and can only marvel. For it is clear to everyone that the meeting will not remove our economic difficulties from the agenda and will not increase supplies of commodities in our stores.

Other publications say that G. Bush needs the meeting more since he has been criticized for acting timidly in conditions of "turbulent change in the Soviet Union and the countries of East Europe" and—more accurately—for his slow and cautious reaction to "these countries' historic departure from communism," and he also wants to wipe out criticism of him through this meeting.

To President Bush's credit, according to the press, he believes in "personal diplomacy" and understands perfectly well what he wants from his meeting with M.S. Gorbachev. Sincere understanding is a very important aspect of the foreign policy process, the President said once. Especially since things are by no means always "tip-top" in Soviet-U.S. relations.

"We are all aware now that the personal element is of tremendous significance for contemporary policy," M.S. Gorbachev pointed out, speaking at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the summer.

At the coming meeting the "personal element" and "personal diplomacy" are designed to play a more important role than ever before. The two states' leaders want to get to know one another better, and talk unofficially, without an advance agenda. But it is the "personal element" that also troubles certain Americans, for some reason arousing skepticism and even the following opinion: "This is a danger to which we should not expose ourselves"...

Certainly, the term—"the danger of the meeting"—has appeared in the West. I wonder: Why danger? What danger can lurk in a frank conversation? People see danger, strange as this may seem, in the fact that M.S. Gorbachev may be preparing a "surprise" or a "preemptive strike," and then G. Bush will find himself in the "role of defender," and so America will look bad. They remember Reykjavik when President Reagan talked without an agenda and did not look his best in his allies' eyes. Admittedly, his compatriots by no means consider their President a novice in diplomacy and are convinced that he will not surrender in the face of "surprises" or "preemptive strikes."

All the same, the following opinion predominates today: The impending meeting is a step in the right direction.

The direction of triumph for common sense, peace, trust, respect, and tranquility on Earth, This is a historic opportunity. It would be unforgivable to miss this opportunity.

Genscher on Talks With Bush, Malta Meeting

PM2211172989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Washington Talks"]

[Text] Washington, 22 Nov—U.S. President George Bush held talks in the White House Tuesday with FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher, who is here on a short visit. During the talks main attention was devoted to East-West relations and events in East Europe.

H.D. Genscher stated at a press conference after the talks that both sides were "firmly agreed" about the need to develop East-West relations. He particularly stressed that his visit to Washington and consultations with the White House chief coincide with an important coming event in international life—the meetings between the Soviet and U.S. leaders off the coast of Malta. "We believe that good relations between the United States and the USSR increase the chance of detente and disarmament in Europe," the minister noted.

He expressed the hope that the "meeting between the President and our Soviet friends will be successful" and that this will accord with the interests of developing East-West relations. We will be able to look to the future with greater confidence, and we can view the talks between President G. Bush and President M.S. Gorbachev from these positions.

Touching on the situation in Europe, H.D. Genscher called the Soviet leader's idea of creating a common European home constructive. "We have always advocated this. The disarmament and arms control process needs to be given new dynamism." It is important, he

pointed out, for disarmament and arms control to go hand-in-hand with the process of political transformations in Europe, which will serve the cause of strengthening cooperation on the continent.

We also take account of the Soviet Union's security interests, the minister continued. We can see that the USSR is interested in supporting and maintaining stability in Europe, and we, for our part, are interested in guaranteeing the success of the reforms taking place in East Europe. We do not want to derive any unilateral advantage for ourselves from the problems or difficulties emerging in the process of the transformations taking place in East and central Europe.

Talking about the Soviet Union, H.D. Genscher stated that M.S. Gorbachev has carried out a "genuinely historic feat thanks to the policy of perestroyka and glasnost, which have opened the way to new thinking." He also noted that the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan and the conclusion of the Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles attest to the positive changes in the Soviet Union's foreign policy.

Official White House spokesman M. Fitzwater, briefing journalists on the talks between G. Bush and H.D. Genscher, said that they discussed the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. unofficial summit off the coast of Malta and other issues of mutual interest. The White House spokesman stressed that the President considers the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. meeting to be historic. "Everyone realizes that this meeting will go down in history, if only because it is taking place at a historic time." At the same time, M. Fitzwater continued, the U.S. President "is trying not to create the hope that any specific written agreements will be reached at the meeting." "I believe it will result in a privately reached understanding, personal convictions, and personal feelings that the current situation will be of historic importance in the long term, and perhaps in the next 2 years as well," he said.

U.S. Withdraws Criticism of SFRY on Crackdown

PM2111143989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Ye. Vostrukhov dispatch: "Even Americans Have Understood Truth About Events in Kosovo"]

[Text] As IZVESTIYA reported earlier, U.S. congressmen have repeatedly raised the question this year of allegedly serious violations of human rights in Yugoslavia, and especially in the Kosovo Autonomous Province. In June the U.S. Senate even passed a special resolution on the violation of human rights in the SFRY, demanding of the government in an insulting manner that it end violations of democratic freedoms on the country's territory.

The special measures to protect public order in Kosovo were adopted in full accordance with the constitution in response to the extremist actions of the Kosovo nationalists and separatists, who tried to use firearms against the militia and public security forces, organized disturbances in the city and village streets, attacked public buildings, and stoned buses and homes. The current trial of the province's former political and economic leaders has prompted another upsurge in the Kosovo separatists' actions. The defendants have been charged by the prosecutor's office with conniving with the nationalists and committing antistate actions. Demonstrations against the trial were held not only in certain cities in Kosovo, Slovenia, and Croatia, but also in some foreign countries. And although nearly all the special measures have now been lifted, the demonstrators are still claiming that human rights are being violated and that the trial in Kosovo is illegal.

During these difficult days, the Yugoslavs have received unexpected support from... U.S. congressmen. A TANJUG correspondent reports from Washington that the U.S. Senate has withdrawn its July resolution on the alleged violation of basic human rights and freedoms in the SFRY, including the Kosovo Autonomous Province. Congressmen in both chambers of Congress have finally arrived at the conclusion that there is no evidence of violation of human rights in Kosovo, merely an ordinary "ethnic conflict."

What made the congressmen change their minds? The Yugoslav press cites several factors. The visit to Yugoslavia, including Kosovo, last month by a number of members of the U.S. Congress, the very fruitful recent visit to the United States by Yugoslav head of government A. Markovic, which "exceeded expectations," the painstaking explanatory work undertaken by the SFRY Embassy in Washington... Whatever it was, the truth about the events in Kosovo has reached Capitol Hill.

I would like to mention in conclusion that the federal prosecutor rejected as unjustified the demand by the defendants that the trial be transferred from Serbia to another republic. The Kosovo Supreme Court deemed the demand that all the appointed judges be barred from taking part in the trial to be equally unjustified. According to the local press, the trial of A. Vlasi and 14 other defendants will resume at Titova-Mitrovica Monday 20 November.

TASS Notes Space Shuttle Landing Date

LD2411092989 Moscow TASS in English 0845 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] New York November 24 TASS—The U.S. space shuttle Discovery which was launched on Wednesday night is expected to land at 19:02 local time today at Edwards Air Force Base in California, according to a NASA report issued late on Thursday.

The five-member crew is feeling well and the flight is proceeding smoothly, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration report said.

U.S. space officials would not elaborate on the secret mission which was sponsored by the Pentagon.

Press reports indicate that the main task of this mission [was] to deploy on Thursday a 2.5 tonne satellite capable of eavesdropping on military and diplomatic communications and monitoring ballistic missile launches.

Canada's Prime Minister Continues Visit

Signs Joint Declaration

PM2211142589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Signing of Declaration"]

[Text] On 21 November M.S. Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and Canadian Prime Minister M.B. Mulroney signed a Soviet-Canadian political declaration.

This ceremony—the culmination of the official visit to the USSR by the head of the Canadian Government—took place in the Vladimir Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace. Taking part were: on the Soviet side—N.I. Ryzhkov, E.A. Shevardnadze, and A.N. Yakovlev and other officials; on the Canadian side—J. Clark and officials accompanying the prime minister.

Seen Off by Ryzhkov on Tour

LD2211185289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1709 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Nov (TASS)—Canadian Prime Minister Martin Brian Mulroney left Moscow for Kiev today.

At Vnukovo airport the guest and his wife were seen off by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and his wife; Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Minister of foreign affairs; and other officials.

The state flags of Canada and the Soviet Union were hoisted at the airport. A guard of honor from the Moscow Garrison was formed up on the runway. A band played the state anthems of the two countries.

Nikolay Ryzhkov and Brian Mulroney inspected a formation of Soviet troops.

The solemn farewell ceremony was completed by a marchpast by the guard of honor.

The state flags of the two countries were raised on the streets and squares along the route followed by the motorcade.

Address to Business Group Noted

LD2311000289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Prime Minister of Canada Brian Mulroney, who is in our country on a visit, met today with representatives of Soviet and Canadian business circles. The document founding the the Canadian-Soviet Business Council was signed in Moscow on the same day. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Brian Mulroney, prime minister of Canada, participated in the ceremony. The speeches by the heads of the governments on this occasion stressed the importance of the creation of this nongovernmental organization, which is intended to promote the expansion of business cooperation and trade between the USSR and Canada and to provide business circles with assistance in solving problems which arise. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov said, in particular:

[Begin recording] [Ryzhkov] The present Soviet-Canadian talks in Moscow are a kind of turning point in mutual relations between the two countries, which opens up horizons of dynamic and future-orientated cooperation. Evidence of this is the range of intergovernmental agreements, embracing virtually all fields of bilateral interaction, signed during the visit. Therefore, we have grounds for believing that the infrastructure of Soviet-Canadian cooperation exists, in its main contours; and it is for you, businesspeople, to fill it with content. I want to assure you that the newly-established Business Council will meet with understanding and support from the USSR Council of Ministers in all its mutually-useful undertakings. The prospects which are opening up promise much. We are dealing, alongside traditional forms of economic ties—principally, trade—with the creation of joint enterprises, the implementation of major ecological projects, the joint entry into the markets of third countries and the transfer onto the tracks of the 21st century of the field of the agro-industrial complex, which is traditional for us. We have reliable reference points for movement along this route. [end recording]

More on Address

PM2411105789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "A Business Council Must Be Businesslike"]

[Text] Soviet-Canadian trade and economic ties have received a fresh boost: The basic document regarding the creation of the Canadian-Soviet Business Council was signed 22 November in Moscow. N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Canadian Prime Minister B. Mulroney took part in the ceremony.

The council's tasks include broadening Soviet-Canadian business cooperation and trade, developing juridical contacts, assisting the two countries' business circles in gathering commercial information, organizing seminars and exhibitions, and helping solve problems that may arise. V.L. Malkevich, chairman of the USSR Chamber

of Commerce and Industry Presidium, and A. Reichmann, president of the Canadian Olympia and York Company, have been elected cochairmen of this nongovernmental organization. The Canadian-Soviet Business Council will be registered as a Canadian corporation with its headquarters in Toronto (Canada) and a mission in Moscow. Both offices, where mixed Soviet-Canadian personnel will work, will be opened at the end of the first quarter of 1990.

In his speech in connection with the founding of the Canadian-Soviet Business Council N.I. Ryzhkov said that this is a good occasion for representatives of our countries' business world to meet. I believe, he stressed, that in the history of Soviet-Canadian relations there has never before been such a prestigious and representative gathering of all those people who are involved or who see prospects for their involvement in building a bridge of trade and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Canada with intensive two-way traffic.

I can say without exaggeration that this event fits into the historical context because the decision to set up the council is taking a specific form during the official visit to the USSR by Canada's prime minister Mr Mulroney.

M.S. Gorbachev asked me to convey warmest greetings and wishes to the participants in today's ceremony. The current Soviet-Canadian talks in Moscow are a kind of watershed in relations between the two countries, revealing the prospect of dynamic cooperation geared to the future. This is illustrated by the series of intergovernmental agreements encompassing virtually all spheres of bilateral cooperation which have been signed during your visit. That is why we have grounds for thinking that the main outlines of the infrastructure of Soviet-Canadian cooperation already exist. You businessmen must structurally develop this infrastructure.

But that is only one aspect of the problem. The other, which is equally important, is the fact that the creation of the Canadian-Soviet Business Council reflects new trends in world economic ties and growing tendencies to democratize and eliminate everything that impedes the free development of these ties. It is on these processes that we pin our hopes of establishing a new partnership in the world, not only in politics but also in the economy.

It has not hitherto proved possible for us to bring Soviet-Canadian trade and economic ties into line with our countries' and peoples' colossal potential and their craving for mutual rapprochement. One of the reasons for this was the fact that government bodies often tried to bite off more than they could chew and predetermine everything and did not create conditions for an enterprising and creative approach to enterprises and organizations.

Today, astride the wave of perestroyka, we see our main task as being to create a kind of most favored nation status for everyone who is inclined toward mutually beneficial cooperation—firms, corporations, associations, enterprises, and cooperatives. You take a direct part in trade and economic exchanges, your ties and contacts form their living fabric. It is for you to decide and act. It is our business—the business of governments and departments within the governmental system—to help you establish contacts and cooperation by every means within our power.

I want to assure you that in all its mutually useful ventures the new Business Council will meet with understanding and support from the USSR Council of Ministers. In turn, he said, we expect fresh approaches from this prestigious body—approaches free from stereotypes. We should not be discouraged if we encounter difficulties on this new path. The emergent prospects are very promising. Alongside traditional forms of economic ties, primarily trade, it is a question of creating joint enterprises, implementing major environmental projects, trading jointly in third countries' markets, and switching cooperation in our traditional sphere—the agro-industrial complex—to the 21st century. We have reliable guidelines for advancing along this road—existing experience of cooperation, geographical proximity, closeness in the polar region, mutual interests, and mutual advantage.

In conclusion N.I. Ryzhkov wished the council great success. He is convinced that the council comprises real pioneers and trailblazers initiating promising movement through the endless expanses of USSR-Canadian cooperation.

Despite the fact that it is winter on our streets, spring is in the air in the sphere of international relations, that is how B. Mulroney optimistically began his speech.

A new political structure is taking shape in Europe, he said, as the old postwar order changes. Canadians know that all these changes were sparked off by the new thinking which took shape in the Soviet Union and which is manifest above all in the program for internal political reforms and also in Soviet leaders' clear statements, which confirm all peoples' right to choose their own path of development without outside interference.

East-West relations are now inspiring greater optimism than at any time since the war. Canadian-Soviet relations are also on the brink of a new era. There are three very important areas in which cooperation between our two countries could prove particularly fruitful. Canada and the Soviet Union can do a great deal together to boost the effectiveness of the system of international relations. In the course of the conversations over the last 3 days our country's tremendous interest in the Soviet Union's renewed desire for multifaceted cooperation was mentioned.

The second area of cooperation is the development of the North and environmental protection. The agreements signed during the visit form the foundation for joint actions in this sphere. The third area is business relations. The establishment of the Business Council opens up a new and promising chapter in Canadian-Soviet trade and industrial cooperation. The council's activity

will deepen and strengthen Canadian-Soviet economic ties. It is in our common interests to ensure that this activity proves successful.

Approximately 200 representatives of Canada's business circles accompanied me to Moscow to meet their Soviet colleagues. They are all endeavoring to help enrich your country not only with investments but also with technology, new professions, and practical experience, which will help successfully resolve the Soviet Union's economic problems.

Assessing the economic situation in the world, B. Mulroney voiced the supposition that the competitive struggle in the economic world where the USSR and Canada live will increase in intensity in the future. In this connection, he pointed out, Canada supports USSR participation in the system of international trade and payments and advocates USSR-OECD cooperation. Canada, B. Mulroney pointed out, considers it necessary to examine the possibility of granting the USSR observer status at GATT with the subsequent establishment of organizational relations with this agreement's participants.

Speaking about Canadian-USSR economic relations, the guest stressed that they have hitherto been characterized by their relatively modest scale. Canada has exported grain to the Soviet Union for 30 years.

Our countries also maintain fruitful ties in the sphere of the oil and gas industry.

We have tried, he said, to help Soviet export organizations on Canadian territory by creating a group dealing with trade with the USSR in order to increase Soviet exports to our country. We hope to extend the opportunities for training Soviet economic leaders in Canada by joint efforts.

But, unfortunately, our relations are still far from what they quite easily could be. Canada and the Soviet Union, which are northern Arctic countries and neighbors, have a very great deal in common, apart from our common love of ice hockey. We have similar problems and opportunities. We are both familiar with the problems of living in a cold climate, building houses and industrial enterprises on permafrost, having to navigate through ice floes and drill in ice fields, conducting agriculture in conditions of a short dry growing season, producing timber products, extracting minerals, and protecting the natural environment.

We also have to deal with all the problems and all the opportunities inherent in a modern industrial society—ranging from the construction of modern housing, offices, and hotels, the production of steel, automobiles, transport and communications systems, and food enterprises, and the use and elimination of waste products to space-age technologies. The agreements we signed this week—particularly if they are followed by the further liberalization of Soviet legislation in the sphere of investments and, ultimately, ruble convertibility—will provide a firm foundation for broadening economic activity between our two countries.

The creation of the Canadian-Soviet Business Council is a very good sign that both sides want to establish new economic relations. They will serve as the foundation for the new phase in Canadian-USSR relations which we entered this week.

On the same day B. Mulroney met with representatives of Soviet and Canadian business circles.

Shevardnadze on Mulroney Visit

PM2311165189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Interview with E.A. Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, by unnamed IZVESTIYA correspondent on the results of the visit to the Soviet Union of Prime Minister B. Mulroney of Canada: "Common Concerns, Close Partnership"; date, place not specified]

[Text] Question: The visit of Prime Minister B. Mulroney of Canada to our country has just ended. It was the first visit by a Canadian head of government to the USSR in 18 years. That in itself makes it a major event in Soviet-Canadian relations. What can you say about the main political results of the Soviet-Canadian talks held in Moscow?

Answer: Allow me to go back a little way and begin with the "natural philosophy," as it were, of the Soviet-Canadian dialogue.

History and geography provide an exceptionally favorable backdrop for this dialogue, a kind of natural "most-favored-nation status." It is enough to glance at the map to see for oneself that nature favors the development of good-neighborly relations between the USSR and Canada. Their very geographical proximity and similar natural conditions, their location within the Arctic and Pacific regions, common concerns about the protection of the environment and marine resources, and mutual interest in enhancing the well-being of our peoples alone dictate the need for close cooperation and mutually advantageous partnership between the Soviet Union and Canada.

I would also like to highlight a specific feature of our relations—the extensive ties of an ethnic nature which link our two great northern peoples. A substantial number of Canadians are natives of our country or their descendants and their relatives, distant and close relatives, live in many union republics. To this you have to add the common roots, way of life, and customs of the ethnic groups of the Soviet and Canadian north. All these multifaceted human, and hence also spiritual, bonds act like a powerful motor of international and interstate rapprochement. Inherent in the moral renaissance which Soviet society is currently undergoing is also a feeling of new closeness with compatriots abroad,

including those in Canada, and efforts to ensure free, mutually enriching contacts with them.

The closeness of the fundamental national interests of the USSR and Canada also springs from the similarity of our two countries' approaches to the assessment of the current crucial stage of world development and their desire to consolidate the present trend from confrontation and ideological intransigence to the establishment of broad and mutually advantageous cooperation between East and West and among all states. It is significant that the concept of new political thinking put forward by the Soviet Union and the Canadian concept of constructive internationalism strike a common chord both in philosophical terms and in many concrete manifestations.

In recent years our relations with Canada have resembled a not easy but consistent climb toward a mountain pass beyond which new horizons of cooperation would open up, fully revealing the full potential of Soviet-Canadian collaboration. The Soviet-Canadian talks in Moscow were just such a pass, a most important milestone. Their political climax was the talk between M.S. Gorbachev and B. Mulroney. As the Soviet leader stressed, the Canadian prime minister's visit to the USSR ranks among the events which help to change the world situation with a focus on a better future. The energy generated by this profound philosophical and probing discussion is materializing right now into the dynamic of practical cooperation and the establishment of cardinal political positions.

The Political Declaration signed by the leaders of our states is an intellectual and political breakthrough into the new, interdependent world which has left the obstructions of the "cold war" behind and is confidently looking into the future. A document of this caliber and significance could emerge only in conditions of perestroyka in the Soviet Union and of fundamental changes in the surrounding world. It harmoniously incorporates the universal problems facing mankind on the threshold of the 3d millenium and the solution of specific questions which reflect the unique features of Soviet-Canadian relations. In this respect the Political Declaration can be compared with a powerful icebreaker which has made it possible to replace the experimental trail across the Artic ice with a broad highway linking our countries and peoples.

Question: Speaking to journalists in Moscow, the prime minister of Canada expressed himself unequivocally in support of perestroyka in our country and noted that it opens up unprecedented opportunities for bilateral Soviet-Canadian cooperation. What are the practical results of the visit in this respect?

Answer: First of all I would like to confirm that both Mr Mulroney and the officials accompanying him displayed not only profound interest in the clarification of the problems of perestroyka, but also considerable knowledge of these questions. We, in turn, acting in the spirit of complete frankness, briefed the Canadian representatives on the complexities of the transitional stage through which the country is passing and which, at the same time, cannot shake the faith of the absolute majority of the Soviet people in the ultimate triumph of the spiritual and economic renewal of Soviet society. More than once this constructive, businesslike discussion took the course of a comparitive analysis of similar social processes under way in the Soviet Union and Canada. It showed once again that the times when differences and contradictions were absolute are receding into the past and are being steadily replaced by joint reflection and creation.

Let us take, for example, the nationalities problem, that acute problem facing modern society. This is a very delicate process affecting the national feelings and future of any country which encounters it. Unbidden external interference is absolutely intolerable here. But an exchange of experience on, for example, questions of federalism is a useful thing. It was just such a constructive exchange of opinions that took place during Mr Mulroney's visit, and we agreed to continue it at the level of scientists and experts. The signing of the intergovernmental memorandum on cooperation between the union republics of the USSR and the Canadian provinces follows the same path of mutual enrichment. I would venture to say that the character and content of that agreement are in many respects redolent of the perestroyka processes in our country and will help to strengthen them.

On the whole, although neither we nor the Canadian side were after "mass production" here, we nevertheless concluded more agreements due to this visit than in the previous 20 years. I say with complete responsibility that they all benefit perestroyka and at the same time serve the interests of the reorganization of international relations on the new bases of global interdependence.

It is common knowledge that keen concern and heated discussions—to some extent even belatedly—are now being caused in our country by environmental problems. Canada, however, was one of the first to place questions of environmental protection on the international agenda and has achieved remarkable successes in this area. Therefore, we attach great significance to and regard as an encouraging beginning the environmental accords signed in Moscow—the agreement on cooperation on questions of the environment, the memorandum of mutual understanding on cooperation in the prevention and monitoring of the pollution of the marine habitat of the Arctic, and two other memorandums.

International cooperation in the sphere of the exploration and peaceful use of space is indispensable for improving the environmental situation and, of course, for solving many other national economic tasks as well. Soviet-Canadian cooperation in this sphere has already borne tangible fruit. For example, the Cospas/Sarsat satellite search and rescue system for ships and aircraft in distress, in which the USSR and Canada take part, has

enabled the lives of more than 1,500 people to be saved. The new intergovernmental agreement on space concluded during the visit will considerably broaden the horizons of our two countries' mutually beneficial cooperation in the most advanced areas of space science and technology. Of the other agreements I shall mention those connected with cooperation in the Arctic and the struggle against drug addiction.

You would think that these were problems which did not overlap, but they have one important common aspect: the good of our—and, of course, the Canadian—people. After all, questions of the economy and crime are now particularly sensitive for our society's fabric, which is being renewed.

Returning to your question, I must say that I immediately noticed an economic implication in it. In M.S. Gorbachev's conversation with B. Mulroney, during the talks between the Canadian Prime Minister and N.I. Ryzhkov, and in my conversations with J. Clark and other Canadian government representatives, the theme of economic cooperation between the USSR and Canada was broached a number of times. We made it clear that it is not a question of "help" from the West but that it would be equally beneficial for us and our partners to make use of the new opportunities created by perestroyka for the vigorous development of economic ties.

In this regard the Canadian leadership is showing a laudable far-sightedness and helping by both word and action to involve the Soviet economy in the present-day world economic system.

Over 200 businessmen representing 129 Canadian firms accompanied the Canadian Prime Minister to Moscow. All those companies have joined the Canadian-Soviet business council instituted during the visit. More than 40 organizations and enterprises have joined it from our side. During the 5 days of the visit agreements were concluded worth almost $1 billion, while the number of joint ventures created has doubled to around 50 now. Furthermore, they are in such important sectors as metallurgy, oil extraction and refining, machine building, the production of transport facilities and medical equipment and preparations, and the construction of hotels and apartment blocks in the USSR.

Unlike business in some other Western countries, Canadian business is aware of powerful government support behind it—reflected, in particular, in the signing of the intergovernmental agreement on the encouragement and reciprocal protection of capital investments.

Generally speaking, predictability and confidence are two of the most important practical results of the Soviet-Canadian dialogue on questions of bilateral cooperation in the past few days.

Of course, the new scale of cooperation means additional responsibility and new pressures for those taking part in it on both the Soviet and Canadian sides. This applies to our diplomats and to representatives of other organizations and departments. For our part, we and the Canadian Ministry for External Relations have tried to create new groundwork during the visit to prevent us from being overwhelmed by a flood of bilateral contacts and exchanges.

The Soviet side intends to open a consulate general in Toronto. The details will be agreed via diplomatic channels. In our view, the setting up of a Soviet consulate general in this major Canadian political, industrial, financial, and cultural center will promote the expansion of bilateral trade and economic ties, exchanges in the sphere of science, technology, culture, education, and sports, as well as contacts between people in general.

I think that this news will also gratify our citizens who visit Canada both for personal reasons and as part of ordinary delegations. Our consular officials and all diplomatic representatives in Canada have been instructed to give them the utmost attention and support.

Question: In the materials on the course of the visit published in the press and in press briefings Canadian and Soviet representatives noted the unusual closeness in the approaches taken toward topical international problems—not least in the security sphere—by two countries belonging to different military-political alliances. What is the explanation for this?

Answer: Probably the simplest answer would be to cite the fundamental provision of the Political Declaration by M.S. Gorbachev and B. Mulroney, which reflects the new nature of the world we live in, where postwar ideological tension is giving way to a more positive atmosphere and where numerous global challenges require that states pursue a policy of rapprochement with each other. Reason and new political thinking cannot be squeezed into the Procrustean bed of the usual scenarios of East-West rivalry—be it in individual regions or in the military sphere.

Of course, we have many differences with Canada in this area. And that is understandable, bearing in mind the full complexity and multiplicity of the problems facing any country's foreign policy. However, the similarity of our approaches at the conceptual level is predetermining the appearance of more and more new spheres of agreement on specific international problems, too. This applies in particular to consistent support for the United Nations and the strengthening of its role in the creation of lasting international law and order. During the talks in Moscow we also reached agreement on the abiding importance of the all-European process as the only healthy basis on which the turbulent processes of building a new, democratic, and indivisible "common European home" are now developing. There has also been an agreement as regards the galvanization of Soviet-Canadian collaboration in creating a favorable atmosphere for a political settlement in Central America, southern Africa, Southeast Asia, the Near East, and other regions.

Our talks on the questions of disarmament and confidence-building were fruitful, too. People who think that on these questions only partnership between countries with comparable military potentials can be effective are mistaken. The Soviet-Canadian example proves the opposite: The main thing is not just the military balance but a balance of good will and reciprocal peace-loving intentions. In particular, we have succeeded in coordinating and comparing our positions in spheres such as the elaboration of mechanisms for verifying arms limitation and reduction—verifying that weapons are not launched into space, for instance—as well as in expanding military "transparency."

The Soviet Union will participate in the most active fashion in implementing the Canadian initiative to hold an international conference in Ottawa on the "open skies" idea. Moreover, in Wyoming we put forward a proposal to expand this initiative, making sea, land, and space "open", too.

The Arctic aspect of security has a special place in our disarmament dialogue with Canada—after all, the Arctic is our common "northern roof."

The Soviet Union consistently advocates turning the Arctic into a peace zone free of nuclear weapons and reducing military activities in the region. I am sure that the initiatives put forward in Murmansk in this direction are a good basis for dialogue between our countries. We informed the Canadian side about new steps in this sphere that develop the Murmansk initiative. First, we are prepared to state here and now that Soviet submarines will not enter the waters of the Canadian archipelago. Moreover, we would be prepared to agree with the United States and other states possessing strategic aircraft to limit the areas in which combat training flights by nuclear-capable aircraft can be carried out. The Canadian side made a high assessment of our new initiatives and expressed the hope that the fruitful collaboration between the two countries in this sphere would be continued in the future.

China

PRC Protest Over Continuing U.S. Sanctions

PM2211124589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 First Edition p3

[Unattributed report: "Protest Made"]

[Text] PRC Deputy Foreign Minister Liu Huaqiu has protested to James R. Lilley, U.S. ambassador to the PRC, in connection with the approval by the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate of amendments to bills concerned with retaining sanctions against China introduced earlier, XINHUA reports.

These sanctions envisage, in particular, a ban on exports of American weapons and space technology to the PRC and also on assistance in the trade sphere.

Since the suppression of the counterrevolutionary uprising in Beijing, the protest says, the U.S. Congress has repeatedly interfered in the PRC's internal affairs and raised an anti-China uproar, adopting one resolution after another on a matter that is China's internal affair. The present amendments represent a further escalation of actions to cause a deterioration in Chinese-U.S. ties. They wound the national feelings of the Chinese people and are causing serious damage to bilateral relations, the document stresses.

State Planning Group Meets Yao Yilin in PRC

OW1811074189 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] Chinese Vice Premier Yao Yilin met with the Soviet State Planning Commission delegation led by its vice chairman, Malakhov, on 17 November. During the meeting, Yao Yilin briefed the Soviet guests on China's experience in building special economic zones. Yao Yilin also had a conversation with them on developing long-term cooperation projects between the two countries and on other issues as well.

The Soviet delegation arrived in Beijing on 9 November to attend the third meeting of the standing group of the Chinese and Soviet State Planning Commissions.

New PRC Magazine Aims To Build Friendship

PM2111093989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Nov 89 Second Edition p 5

[B. Barakhta report under the "Sunday Mosaic" rubric: "Publishing: 'Long Live Understanding!'"]

[Text] Of late you can frequently hear the slogan cited in our headline in the PRC. It has indeed been won by the Chinese people on the difficult and tortuous path of building a new society.

That is why it is no coincidence that the editorial board of the new Chinese magazine MOST [Bridge] begins its address to Soviet readers with a wish for understanding between our great peoples. The colorful publication sees its main task as being to deepen and develop the friendship and cooperation between the PRC and the USSR.

In the first edition of the magazine, which is aimed at a wide readership, you can learn about the activity of businessmen in Shenzheng, the history of the "Great Silk Road," Soviet pilots who fought in the skies over China, the children of Liu Shaoqi, PRC president who suffered repression during the "Cultural Revolution," the wonders of traditional Chinese medicine, and renowned Chinese cooking. Thus, bon voyage along the bridge of friendship, magazine!

Northeast Asia

Commentator on Yakovlev's Japan Visit

OW2311163589 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 21 Nov 89

[By foreign affairs commentator Mikhaylov]

[Text] This year, there have been many signs of new hope in Soviet-Japanese relations. The most significant and meaningful event among them is the visit to Japan by the Supreme Soviet delegation led by Yakovlev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee. This visit took place on the 25th anniversary of Soviet-Japanese parliamentary exchanges. On the one hand, it was a recapitulation of previous exchanges up to this time, and on the other, it meant the opening of a new page. This is because the delegation represented the relatively new Supreme Soviet born out of democratic reforms undertaken in the Soviet Union.

The agreement on Chairman Gorbachev's visit to Japan in 1991 was a particuarly important factor in giving the visit a positive character. Yakovlev's talks with Japanese Diet members were precisely undertaken as a preparation for the historical event. Moreover, Yakovlev's meeting with the Japanese emperor pointed to the new quality of today's Soviet-Japanese relations. Contacts between the two countries during the visit were rich in content. They indicated both sides' wish to promote mutual understanding. During the visit, Japan showed its keen interest in developments in the USSR. It became an opportune occasion for the Japanese public to deepen its understanding of perestroyka. During all the gatherings in Japan, perestroyka came up as a topic of discussion.

Mr Yakovlev, who led the delegation, is chairman of the International Policy Commission of the CPSU Central Committee. It it is only natural that a substantial portion of their talks should have been devoted to major international issues. In the end, it became evident that the Soviet Union and Japan were close or in accord on basic concepts, despite some differences. It is probable that the area of mutual understanding in this regard is steadily expanding. We believe that this will contribute to solidifying the basis for further improvement of Soviet-Japanese friendly relations in the future.

There is no doubt, however, that the primary issue in the talks is Soviet-Japanese diplomatic relations—the current situation and future of relations. It is very meaningful that both sides have confirmed their desire to abide by the past agreement on the improvement of Soviet-Japanese bilateral relations, in the hopes of opening a new page in relations between the two countries as soon as possible.

As you would agree, the central issue in that regard is the establishment of the legal basis of the Soviet-Japanese Peace Treaty. Regarding the treaty, there are similarities in the positions of the two countries on some aspects, but as far as the border question is concerned, differences remain unresolved just as before.

Mr Yakovlev, while visiting Japan as head of the delegation, in view of the differences, suggested a third route for solution of the issue, proposing a cool-headed and constructive dialogue while proceeding with work to improve relations in wide-ranging areas.

The positions of both sides are complicated and delicate. We think his proposal offers an approach, which is most ideal and logical for the solution of such problems. The Soviet side requests that all differences be removed promptly [words indistinct]. This can be done only through the positive cooperation of both sides. Furthermore, we feel the idea for the third route is agreeable to a certain degree to the Japanese side, because it desires the development of balanced relations with the Soviet Union.

Naturally, results of the Supreme Soviet delegation's visit to Japan need to be studied and analyzed further, but we do not doubt the great political significance of the results of the visit. We believe the results very well represent both nations' hope that the parliamentary exchange enabled a major step in the improvement of their bilateral relations.

Territorial Issue Still Dogs Ties With Japan

PM2111102989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent S. Agafonov article: "The Tokyo Puzzle, or On the Benefit of Interparliamentary Exchanges"]

[Text] Tokyo—Readers who have followed the protocol reports carried by IZVESTIYA already know that a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation headed by A.N. Yakovlev is visiting Japan. The visit has an exceptionally full program of meetings, conversations, receptions, and highly useful contacts which were also reported in detail. But the Soviet delegation's stay in Japan also has its full share of uncommon drama, a kind of internal intrigue which is either far less well known or not known at all, since it did not follow the dry protocol lines. At the same time, in my view, this is the most interesting aspect and is therefore worth reporting. If for no other reason than that our Japanese colleagues are going through this aspect of the visit with an exceptionally fine-toothed comb.

I ought to begin by recalling that the previous Soviet parliamentary delegation came to Japan about 5 years ago and left nothing but the annotation "visit completed" in the annals of bilateral ties. This is understandable—there was no talk of perestroyka at that time, Moscow and Tokyo upheld their own rightness, and the chill in relations bothered nobody.

The memory of those unfriendly times is still alive, but think of how much has changed during the last 5 years,

which are but a fleeting moment in historical terms. It is probably hardly worth singing the praises of the policy of new thinking yet again, but the situation really has changed radically, which is noted with unfeigned gratification in the United States and in Europe and with a solid dose of jealousy in Japan. In official contacts the Japanese diligently suppress this far from diplomatic feeling, camouflage it with the thesis of Tokyo's inherently cautious approach, and by way of a counterweight demonstrate deliberate skepticism when it comes to the positive changes in the international situation and appraisals of the internal changes in the USSR, but nevertheless the overtone can be felt "in the lobbies"—the absence of stable autonomous relations with Moscow renders Japan's positions in foreign affairs vulnerable and keeps Tokyo outside the mainstream of major events of world importance.

As a matter of fact, the picture is exactly the same in our own country: We are developing a dialogue with leading powers in the capitalist world while, despite all being well on the surface, we are experiencing a burdensome stagnation in our dialogue with Japan—the undoubted leader in the Asia-Pacific region, an economic superpower, and our nearest neighbor with whom we have not concluded a peace treaty to this day.

The first step toward untangling this exceptionally complex knot was taken last December during the Tokyo visit by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze. At that time the Soviet side made its first attempt to abandon the conventional harsh words, relying on a quest for sensible and mutually acceptable ways to build a constructive dialogue. The December meetings were a breakthrough, with a working group on the peace treaty being set up in its wake at deputy foreign minister level.

Fresh winds started blowing, but by January the impetus had already died, when the Japanese side at the Paris meeting of foreign policy department leaders decided to resume its former uncompromising tone. Correcting this tilt took several months of patient adjustments, which restored both partners' optimism only in May. The pendulum swung again in September, following Tokyo's decision to restrict travel by Japanese citizens to the southern Kuril Islands, which resulted in a harsh statement by our Foreign Ministry. The end of September brought a fresh thaw, caused by the publication of the dates for M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Japan....

I cited the entire chronology of these hesitant moves toward good relations to explain the atmosphere on the eve of our parliamentary delegation's arrival. Given that, whichever way you look at it, contacts between high-level Soviet and Japanese representatives are rare, the visit by the Soviet parliamentarians was assessed here well in advance as a "prologue" to the top-level conversations. Commentaries by local mass media in anticipation of the Supreme Soviet deputies' visit displayed a poorly concealed expectation of a miracle which is overdue in Japanese-Soviet relations, with a dominant belief that A.N. Yakovlev would inevitably bring along something new concerning, of course, the most painful question of bilateral dialogue—the territorial question. This gave rise to the most fantastic conjectures, and the atmosphere, without any exaggeration, was electrified by hopes of Soviet initiatives.

This is a significant factor since, in this process, the Japanese did not bother to seek nonstandard solutions and restricted the scope of their own objectives to consistently telling the Soviet side about the need to solve the territorial problem—the way the Japanese perceive it, of course—as a fundamental condition for all future dealings. It is hardly necessary to be excessively harsh in blaming Tokyo for this lack of a constructive approach—local politicians have been digging themselves into a territorial "hole" so persistently and for such a long time now that any attempt to come out of it of their own accord would be tantamount to "loss of face." There is only one way to avoid this—by relying on other people's proposals. This logic is, of course, poor and even flawed if looked at from our point of view, but the Japanese believe otherwise.

This was the background against which the Soviet parliamentarians began their talks and meetings in Tokyo. The atmosphere was friendly, calm, and even smiling, but every sentence spoken by our representatives was examined by the Japanese side through a microscope focused on the search for a surprise. And when, in a perfectly innocuous situation, during a conversation with the ruling party's general secretary, the conclusion that the Soviet and Japanese approaches toward the territorial question are completely incompatible was followed by the thesis that it is necessary to elaborate a mutually acceptable third way, the floodgates of pent-up expectations opened and the Japanese mass media carried a flood of sensational reports codenamed "the third way," and something that was almost a qualitative turnabout in bilateral relations emerged instantaneously.

The last few days have produced a multitude of interpretations of what the Soviet side might have meant by the term "third way," and their diversity alone testifies to the Japanese inventiveness in the choice of positions on an intractable issue like the territorial question. I may be wrong, but my impression is that Tokyo was simply looking for an excuse for an open public debate on this problem, which was until recently locked within the rigid framework of "nationwide consensus." Admittedly the official stance has not changed one iota, demands to solve "the northern territories problem" were made at virtually every meeting in Tokyo, but nonetheless "the third way" ultimately emerged as a kind of common denominator of conversations which was enthusiastically defined as a guideline for future talks.

Let me run the risk of comparing, in terms of importance, last December's breakthrough and this "third way puzzle," recognizing that both events are equally important for Soviet-Japanese relations. If we call things by their proper names, a year ago the Soviet side agreed for the first time in decades to discuss the territorial

problem with the Japanese, abandoning the thesis that this problem does not exist at all. That gave a colossal impetus to the development of dialogue. Almost a full year had to elapse before that impetus was in phase with the Japanese response: After all, the "third way" is essentially a retreat—maybe camouflaged but a retreat nonetheless—by the Japanese side from its ultimatum tone, a de facto recognition of the fruitlessness of the "strong-arm option."

This appraisal may appear rather too optimistic but, it seems to me, this is the direction in which the tendency is developing. It is a good sign and inspires hope for better things to come.

True enough, it is doubtful whether matters will progress smoothly from now on: The hostility here is rather too deeply rooted, and the mechanism of enmity and mistrust has been only too well tuned in the last decades. Look no further than the thesis that economics and politics are inseparable, a thesis which, as interpreted by the Japanese, has turned into a trivial auction of the economic factor in the political game—it is not being discounted, it is not being reduced to "secondary importance" but used as the main trump card in conversations with Moscow. An obvious anachronism because—if for no other reason—there are dozens of economic partners in the world so that, by being stubborn, Tokyo will inevitably "end up the loser." Common sense, alas, does not produce instantaneous changes, and it is more than likely that it will take years before things get properly in phase here.

So, what is the conclusion? Perhaps the most accurate reply to this question was contained in the statement by A.N. Yakovlev, head of the Soviet parliamentary delegation, at a press conference in the Japanese capital: "Let us deepen and expand our relations in all spheres. There will be more confidence, more understanding, more respect. And all questions will then appear simpler and simpler..." After all, miracles do not happen in this world.

Japanese Spokesman on Creating New Ties

OW1911151889 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] A Supreme Soviet delegation, which is making an official visit to Japan, will leave for the Soviet Union today, 18 November. Japanese Foreign Ministry Spokesman Watanabe, in a briefing held in Tokyo on 17 November, said that the Japanse side generally agrees with the remarks made by Yakovlev, leader of the Supreme Soviet delegation, on development of Soviet-Japanese ties. He thus supported balanced development of Japan's ties with the Soviet Union. Moreover, Mr Watanabe clarified that both sides agreed that it was indispensable to create new Soviet-Japanese relations. He then pointed out that such agreement between the two sides is important.

While stressing the importance of the territorial issue, Mr Watanabe explained need to develop the bilateral relations on a basis of broader viewpoint than previously because the international situation is now changing very rapidly.

Rogachev, Japanese Delegation Discuss Ties

LD1611001289 Moscow TASS in English 1543 GMT 15 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS—A delegation of the Japanese-Soviet Relations Committee of the Socialist Party of Japan, led by Parliament member Kiichi Murayama, now visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee, was received today by Ivor Rogachev, deputy foreign minister of the USSR.

The sides exchanged views on the present state and prospects of relations between the two countries and on ways to promote the positive changes that have appeared in Soviet-Japanese relations. In discussing the international situation, they focussed on processes developing in the Asian-Pacific region.

Mongolian Defense Minister on Armed Forces Cuts

LD1311011889 Moscow World Service in English 2200 GMT 12 Nov 89

[Excerpt] The Mongolian defense minister, Luvsangombyn Molomjamts, has said in an interview with the Ulaanbaatar paper UNEN that the national armed forces will be reduced by the end of next year by 13,000 men. He said 2,200 servicemen have already been demobilized over the last 2 years, but this he added, will not damage the Mongolian Armed Forces defense capability. [passage omitted]

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Interviewed on Cambodian Issue

OW2311150489 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 23 Nov 89

[From the "Current Events and Commentaries" program—station reporter (Shedlov)'s interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev; date and place of interview not given; Rogachev's answers briefly heard in Russian fading into superimposed Chinese translation]

[Text] Listeners: The 10-year-old Cambodia conflict is now at a critical juncture. On the one hand, the parties involved in the conflict have shown a tendency of willingness to seek a political solution. On the other hand, the military situation has become tense again in Cambodia with a danger of escalation of the civil war. How does the Soviet Union assess the situation within and around Cambodia? What is the possible way to solve the issue in Moscow's opinion? These questions were

touched upon in an interview between our reporter Schedrov and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev.

[Schedrov] Comrade Rogachev, how do you assess today's situation in Cambodia?

[Rogachev] We think a new situation has appeared around Cambodia. We may say that the conflict has entered a new stage since Vietnam withdrew its troops in late September this year. The new task at present is not to allow certain forces to announce the restoration of the system of genocide in Cambodia today.

[Schedrov] Not long ago, the UN General Assembly discussed the Cambodian issue, and the Soviet representative voted against the resolution on this issue. Why?

[Rogachev] A lengthy resolution on Cambodia was adopted. When the resolution was put to vote, we opposed it. I wish to point out that we thought the resolution had many serious loopholes and shortcomings and lacked sufficient considerations of the new reality resulting from the process of mediation on the Camboida issue. A careful study of the clauses in the resolution will reveal that they are often self-contradictory. Also, I wish to point out another point: Now, public opinion in the world believes more and more firmly that it is fair and reasonable to adopt urgent measures to settle the Cambodian issue politically. The Pol Pot elements, now known as Khmer Rouge, are bent on seizing political power in Cambodia and restoring the despicable system of genocide. An anxious feeling has thus appeared. This anxious feeling was expressed in many representatives' speeches.

[Schedrov] Do you think that the new spirit manifested in the UN General Assembly discussions on the Cambodian issue indicates a new change in the Western viewpoints on the conflict and the redeployment of the political forces?

[Rogachev] The new spirit manifested in the UN General Assembly discussions on the Cambodian issue may be viewed as a deescalation of confrontation. I want to point out that the positions of Britain, France, and Sweden have all turned toward a more realistic consideration of the overall situation in the region. They are all resolutely opposed to letting the Khmer Rouge resume political power. Australia made a proposal that Cambodia's seat in the United Nations be vacated. I also want to point out that a big change has appeared in the U.S. social opinion. A couple of days ago, THE NEW YORK TIMES published an article by its editorial department. which scathingly criticized the U.S. Government's line with regard to the Cambodia situation.

[Schedrov] Now, all have acknwledged that the Cambodian issue must be settled politically. Some hold that step-by-step efforts be made toward this goal. Others insist that the whole issue be settled politically at one stroke. What is Moscow's view on this matter?

[Rogachev] The Sovet Union, of course, stands for a comprehensive and throughgoing solution, but can neither take the stand of settlement at one stroke nor the stand of no settlement at all. We feel that it is necessary at present to focus efforts on the solution of some questions and try to achieve concrete results.

[Schedrov] What are these questions?

[Rogachev] An example is to send international delegations to Cambodia to check if Vietnam has truly withdrawn its troops. The Cambodian prime minister, Hun Sen, has made a very interesting proposal that the UN Secretary General set up an envoy group and send it to Cambodia under the auspices of the Paris Conference. In view of the need to check if Vietnam really withdrew its troops, it is beneficial to form such an envoy group to fulfill this specific task. The Soviet Union suggested that the United States freeze the supply of weapons to certain parties in Cambodia. This idea was supported by France, not to mention the Indochinese countries. This suggestion was discussed at the UN General Assembly session. We feel that this suggestion may and should achieve logical results.

Rogachev continues: There is another suggestion, which concerns the cease-fire in Cambodia. It was put forward by Thai Prime Minister Chunhawan. In our opinion, this suggestion should also be discussed and should not be shelved. The Thai prime minister also proposed that an unoffical enlarged meeting be held in Jakarta in the near future under the auspices of the Paris Confernece on the Cambodia issue. We feel this measure is of special benefit.

[Schedrov] What are your comments on the proposal that Khmer Rouge be included in the Cambodian provisional coalition government under planning?

[Rogachev] Now, many things are decided by the agreement among the Khmer people themselves—the agreement on the structure of the future political power. It should be noted that today many countries insist on inclusion of Khmer Rouge in the coalition government before election or without a nationwide election. Of course, Phnom Penh holds that this demand is unacceptable. Why? This is because this would be legal and universally recognized only after the Khmer Rouge has won some seats in the election. Before this, Phnom Penh suggested that a leading organ be established on the basis of bilateral contacts. Representatives from the Phnom Penh government and the coalition government headed by Sihanouk should take part in this organ. In this organ, they should create conditions for elections. All these will remarkably promote all forms of negotiations, including the international [guoji] negotiations among the Khmer people.

Supplementing the above, Rogachev said: I wish to point out that a great deal of bilateral work is being done in addition to this. For example, the Soviet Union is holding constant consultations with the United States, China, France, Australia, and countries of Southeast

Asian Nations. All these are helpful to making further progress in seeking solutions to the complicated regional problems.

Commentaries on UN Resolution on Cambodia

'Weak Points' of Document

BK1811080389 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 17 Nov 89

[Text] After a 2-day debate, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution on Cambodia. Supporting this resolution were 124 countries; 17 countries opposed and 12 others abstained. Among the countries opposing the resolution were the Soviet Union, Vietnam, and a number of socialist and nonaligned states. Here is our observer Oleg Schedrov's comments.

Although the resolution was adopted by an overwhelming majority, many countries supporting this resolution did so with some doubts. The document views the well-known attitudes concerning a solution to the Cambodian problem such as the necessity to solve the problem politically, to continue the negotiations among warring parties, and to give the Cambodian people the right to determine their destiny themselves without outside interference. This is a great step forward because past UN resolutions on the Cambodian problem were confrontational in nature. I guess this is due to the influence of recent events which, to a large extent, determine the result of this current UN vote.

The value of the just adopted resolution is determined not by comparing it with previous resolutions but to see how much it reflects the present real situation. In this sense, the document has many weak points. The most important factor influencing the situation in Cambodia is the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops in September. During the United Nations debate, many states, including those in Western Europe, recognized that this troop pullout did take place although it was not supervised by UN representatives. It ought to be said that such an observation has served as a pretext for Britain and Australia to review their attitudes toward Phnom Penh. The UN resolution does not recognize the Vietnamese troop pullout, considering that it lacks proof, and separates this from the process of a comprehensive solution.

Another major circumstance causing indecisiveness in the UN resolution is the wording of the document to include the Pol Pot group in the planned Cambodian coalition government. Although further down it calls for guarantees to prevent the return to past policies which were roundly denounced, raising the issue this way does worries many countries. This unclear resolution leaves room for the genocidal Pol Pot group, the group stained with the blood of millions of Cambodians, and brings to mind a number of delegates who have expressed their special views; the British delegate for instance.

One can cite a number of articles of the resolution which were criticized during the debate. However, it is more important to note a different issue. The adoption of this new resolution can only diminish UN participation in solving the Cambodian problem. This was the conclusion of our commentator Comrade Oleg Schedrov.

Formula Called 'Wrong'

BK1911040889 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 18 Nov 89

[Text] The United Nations General Assembly had just debated the situation in Cambodia. Comrade Aleksey Nikolayev has written a commentary that says:

Comparing this debate at the UN General Assembly with the previous ones, one can see right away that the tone has changed. That is, the question regarding the presence in Cambodia of the Vietnamese troops, which used to be regarded as the main obstacle, has now become secondary. The present most important point is for the parties concerned to increase their efforts in order to settle the common question through negotiations.

As noted by UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar, the success of these efforts depend on the capabilities of the parties concerned in building peace and in recognizing that peace is far better than carrying on the war to kill one's own compatriots. Although progress has been made in this regard, one can see that the current situation in Cambodia has caused varying reactions in the international community.

It is regrettable that the obsolete ideas from the previous years still exist in the resolution adopted at this UN General Assembly session. The resolution mentioned the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, but it did not stress that this action has been fulfilled to the point that Vietnam's politico-military activities have turned into concrete assets for the settlement of the Cambodian problem.

The reasons given by those who drafted the resolution can be summed up: Vietnam must assemble its troops in Cambodia pending complete withdrawal within the framework of a common solution. [sentence as heard] The Soviet delegate voted against this resolution and stressed that such illogical reasons might lead toward a deadlock.

Those who surmise that Vietnamese troops still remain in Cambodia have been attempting to obstruct the cessation of military aid to the Cambodian opposition groups. This has encouraged the Pol Pot clique in its effort to seize power. However, the overwhelming majority of UN members opposed this. This is proved by a point in the resolution that calls for a guarantee to prevent the renewal of the past policy, which was condemned by the world.

In my opinion, this formula is wrong. This should not be called only as the past policy. It is the genocidal Pol Pot

regime opposing the Cambodian people themselves that must be mentioned and condemned.

Concerning the guarantee to prevent the revival of this regime, it is a very easy matter. That is, foreign countries must suspend their arms aid to the Cambodian opposition groups and later completely stop it.

The Soviet Union is always ready to cooperate with other countries concerned in contributing to the search for a solution to the Cambodian problem.

U.S. 'Pressing' Philippines on Military Bases

HK1711025989 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 16 Nov 89

[Text] Philippine Foreign Secretary Raul Manglapus and U.S. Ambassador Nicholas Platt will meet in mid-December to formally start negotiations on the future of the U.S. military bases in the Philippines, whose agreement ends in 1991. According to reports, the United States is pressing the Philippines to allow the bases to remain. U.S. President George Bush demonstrated this during the visit to the United States by President Aquino recently. It has also been reported that President Aquino can only be assured of receiving much-needed financial assistance if the extension of the Military Bases Agreement is assured.

Meanwhile in Manila, a campaign has begun to collect a million signatures backing the removal of the U.S. military bases.

Near East & South Asia

Reaction to Death of Lebanese President

TASS Reports Death

LD2211151489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1428 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Beirut, 22 Nov (TASS)—President of Lebanon Rene Mu'awwad died today as a result of a terrorist act. This was officially reported by the office of the country's prime minister.

There was a powerful explosion today in West Beirut not far from a building where Mu'awwad, who became president only 17 days ago, was receiving official figures in connection with the national celebrations—Independence Day. According to a report from a police representative, a car packed with 200 kilograms of dynamite blew up soon after a motorcade carrying the president, Prime Minister S. al-Huss, and Speaker of the Parliament H. al-Husayni had left Mu'awwad's temporary residence.

According to preliminary information, at least seven people died and dozens of people were injured as a result of the explosion, and fires broke out. The al-Sanai district where the incident occurred has been blocked off by Syrian subunits and the security forces.

Implementation of Al-Ta'if Accords Urged

LD2311131889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1148 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 23 Nov (TASS)—TASS commentator Georgiy Kuvaldin writes:

A villainous crime that has shaken the entire country has been committed in the capital of Lebanon. As a result of the explosion of a car packed with explosives by extremists, the president of the country, Rene Mu'awwad, has been killed. He had been in his post only 17 days, and he died on the day of the national holiday—the 46th anniversary of Lebanon's independence. Twenty-three Lebanese were killed, and there are numerous injuries.

The election of Rene Mu'awwad to the post of president inspired in the hearts of many Lebanese hope for a stabilization of the situation in the country, which is in the grip of the flames of civil war and which has for a prolonged period been deprived of a united leadership. The new president had been elected to his post in accordance with agreements achieved at sessions of the Lebanese parliament in the Saudi town of al-Ta'if. These accords, in the elaboration of which a primary role was played by the Committee of Three on Lebanon and the Arab League, in the view of realistically thinking politicians in the Arab world and in Lebanon itself, laid the foundations for resolving the Lebanese problem, and for preserving the territorial integrity, unity, sovereignty, and Arab membership of the country.

For the first time in many years there appeared, if only remotely and not very clearly outlined, prospects for normalization of the situation in Lebanon. On the instructions of the new president, Salim al-Huss, an experienced and authoritative politician, had begun to form a government. The prerequisites for reducing the rage of passions and for stopping military clashes between different fighting groups began to take shape.

There is no doubt that the act of open terror in this situation is the work of those who aim to frustrate the al-Ta'if accords so as to preserve the division of Lebanon and of those who are not interested in extending the authority of the central government throughout the country. On the other hand, this thoughtless action has convincingly shown that under the extremely complex and critical conditions which have formed today in Lebanon, probably the only way to save the country from a catastrophe and to establish peace and calm on the long-suffering Lebanese soil is the speedy implementation of the al-Ta'if agreements.

Foreign Ministry Statement

LD2311143989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1328 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 23 Nov (TASS)—Below is the text of the statement issued by the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

On 22 November, the national holiday of the Republic of Lebanon, the president of this country, Rene Mu'awwad, was killed as a result of a villanous assassination. An action of political terror was taken against this prominent statesman who actively called for national reconciliation between the Lebanese by way of a dialogue and cooperation.

The removal of the head of state, who was recently elected to this post on a legal, constitutional basis, exposes quite definitely the intentions of those forces which would like to bring to a standstill the incipient process of a peace settlement in Lebanon, and again cast the country into a bloody internecine war. Such a development of events would not only block for a long time any way out of the Lebanese crisis but would seriously cloud the political climate in the region as a whole.

The Soviet Union hopes that the citizens of Lebanon, irrespective of their political aspirations and religious beliefs, will at this complex moment display a feeling of high national responsibility and will not allow the calculations of the organizers of the crime to materialize. What is most important now is a consolidation of all Lebanese around the institutions of legislative and executive power, which are being recreated in accordance with the charter of national consensus.

The Soviet Union is sure that the Arab states and, in particular, the Tripartite Committee, set up on an all-Arab mandate, will undertake efforts aimed at preventing the breakdown of the political settlement in Lebanon based on the al-Ta'if accords, and will continue to assist constructively in the restoration of peace and calm in this country. It is also important for the Lebanese to be supported by the international community, first and foremost by the permanent members of the UN Security Council who, in their statement of 31 October of this year, confirmed their adherence to a peaceful settlement of the Lebanese problem and to achieving Lebanon's unity, sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence.

The Soviet Union will, as before, act energetically in this direction and assist in every way in the regulation of peaceful and creative life in the long-suffering land of Lebanon and in the revival of Lebanon as an active participant in the international community.

Supreme Soviet Sends Condolences

LD2311181289 Moscow TASS in English 1732 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet has conveyed its deepest sympathies to Husayn al-Husayni, president of the Lebanese National Assembly, over the tragic death of Lebanese President Rene Mu'awwad, who was villainously assassinated.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet also conveyed sincere condolences to the family and near ones of the deceased.

Soviet Relations With Israel Seen Changing

90UI0133A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 46, 18-24 Nov 89 p 7

[Interview with Prof Radomir Bogdanov, first deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace: "Unknown Israel"]

[Text]**Usually when people have in the past spoken or written in the Soviet media about the state of Israel, it has been a question more often than not of its expansionist policy in relation to its Arab neighbors and of the intifadah—the Palestinians' just struggle against the occupation of their land. All this is truly a reality of Israel's domestic and foreign policy, which is hardly to be ignored. At the same time journalistic cliches have for a long time closed off to us another Israel—a country in which great influence is being acquired by forces which aspire to live in peace and friendship with their Arab neighbors on the basis of a just solution of the Near East conflict, a country where, together with capitalist, there are other forms of ownership also.**

ARGUMENTY I FAKTY correspondent D. Makarov talks about this unknown Israel with Prof Radomir Bogdanov, first deputy chairman of the Soviet Committee in Defense of Peace.

[Makarov] Radomir Georgiyevich, in the past our domestic oriental studies and journalism have painted Israel in exclusively dark colors. You were in Israel recently. How far, in your opinion, does the image that has been created correspond to reality?

[Bogdanov] It seems to me that in the past we unconditionally, without having given matters too much thought, took one or another's side, without always taking account of our own interests. This would sometimes happen because one party to a conflict was supported by the United States, and we would automatically, as it were, take the opposite side simply because worldwide confrontation with the United States was until recently an important component of our foreign policy.

What has been said applies fully also to the Arab-Israeli conflict, in which we have fully supported only one side while our foreign policy rival, the United States, has managed to maintain relations with almost all parties to the conflict, which, incidentally, has been of inestimable benefit to the United States' ally in the Near East—Israel.

The one-sided, unbalanced position of the USSR, which it has occupied for many years, has also been objectively unjust in respect of the Israeli people. Visiting Israel recently, I took a new look at the problem of its security.

This is not a contrived problem, it really exists, as does, equally, the problem of the security of the Arab countries contiguous with it.

[Makarov] What further stereotypes have disintegrated in your imagination following your visit to Israel?

[Bogdanov] We have become used to considering this a capitalist country, yet socialist communes, kibbutzim, which persist and are thriving to this day, were formed on the territory of Palestine long before the formation of Israel in May 1948. I visited one of them—the oldest, founded in 1921.

[Makarov] Describe it in more detail.

[Bogdanov] It is situated about 50 km from Tel Aviv and only a few kilometers from the area of tension with Syria. It is large by Israeli standards: Approximately 600 families live and work there. The territory accommodating it is unusually small. By our standards, of course.

I have to say that prior to this trip my no. of kibbutzim (like certainly that of many other Sov citizens) was extremely negative. Taking publications in our press as a basis, we imagined kibbutzim to be like military settlements of the Arakcheyev type employing forced labor. This notion of mine has been completely demolished.

The kibbutz which I visited was founded by people from Russia fleeing Petlyura, Makhno, and Skoropadskiy on a bare stony seashore.

Now this community represents a highly efficient, diversified agricultural commune. Plant growing, animal husbandry, horticulture, and a small plant, which manufactures, highly productively, polyethylene packaging for juice bottling and food canning: More than 100,000 units per day are concentrated therein. There is a gold factory there which exports worldwide. Industrial activity accounts for 65 percent of the income, agriculture, only for 35 percent. This change in proportions has occurred in recent years.

[Makarov] How are relations between people on the kibbutz organized?

[Bogdanov] There is no ownership on the kibbutz. Everything belongs to everyone. Money is not used. I saw how they lived. They really do not need money in day-to-day life. Accommodation, food, daycare, kindergarten—all are free. They eat in a large dining hall, where the food is appetizing.

Whoever wishes to eat at home may do so, but all eat together, as a rule—for the sake of company. Houses are built on a two-family basis. They live very comfortably and very modestly. If someone needs to acquire something outside of the kibbutz, furniture, clothing, say, they go to the chairman and get as much money as they need.

[Makarov] Is it difficult taking up residence in such a kibbutz?

[Bogdanov] It is not difficult, no particular formalities for this are required, what is more difficult is getting used to living there. It is necessary to work very conscientiously, hard, and strenuously. And not everyone endures this communal lifestyle, when everyone knows everything about everyone else.

But if you were born on a kibbutz, there is simply no other way of life for you.

The kibbutzniks (as the inhabitants of the kibbutzim call themselves) send their children to the capital to study and serve in the Army, but almost all of them return—owing to the habit of living in a commune.

And, conversely: Many families which come to live on kibbutzim from big cities go back after 3 or 4 months, having failed to adapt.

[Makarov] And what do people in Israel think about the restoration of relations with the USSR?

[Bogdanov] We met with members of the government, representatives of the press, businessmen, and "ordinary people," and this question arose constantly. And, moreover, no one had any doubts as to the need for their restoration. It was a question of when.

[Makarov] And what is the attitude in Israel toward the USSR in general?

[Bogdanov] I have partially already answered your question. But to sum up all our meetings with Israelis, it may be said that there is in Israel tremendous potential for a good attitude toward the Soviet Union, despite the two decades of virtual "cold" war. And when I spoke about this in conversation with an Israeli leader, Shimon Peres, he said that there was no cause for astonishment here. "There is practically no family in Israel which does not have roots in Russia. And we are nostalgic."

Sub-Saharan Africa

Shevardnadze Interviewed on Namibia

LD2311133489 Moscow TASS in English 2011 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—"The Namibian people have exercised their right to free choice in favour of the South-West Africa People's Organizations (SWAPO), which had led the struggle for Namibia's independence over many years, "Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze said in an interview published by the weekly NEW TIMES today.

The very fact that truly democratic and honest elections were conducted is of fundamental importance, Shevardnadze said.

"While congratulating the Namibian people and its vanguard, SWAPO, and acknowledging the efforts fo the

United Nations, the Organisation of Arican Unity and frontline states, we should also commend the stand of South Africa," he said.

"Soviet Africa has made this important initial step towards its return to the international community, even though it was not an easy step to take," he said.

Gratitude should be expressed to United Nations personnel, to people in blue berets, who are now working in Namibia and guaranteeing its freedom and independence.

Shevardnadze emphasised in particular the contribution of U.N. Secretary-General Perez de Cuellar and his special representative in Namibia Martti Ahtisaari. This major operation of the U.N. has demonstrated the United Nations' vast peace-making possibilities.

The Soviet Union's participation in the effort towards Namibia's decolonisation has always been many-faceted, the Soviet foreign minister said. As a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council, the Soviet Union participated in all decisions related to Namibia.

Soviet representatives together with Americans now work on a joint commission for observing the settlement in the south west of Africa. Representatives from Angola, Cuba and South Africa are also on the commission.

The South of Africa is now living through a crucial n oment in its history: Conditions have been created that encourage giving up military confrontation and that provide for a political settlement of the Angolan conflict and for the normalisation of the situation in Mozambique.

New political thinking is taking root in the region, and national priorities and approaches to regional security are being drastically reviewed.

The emergence of the sovereign democratic Namibia and the establishment of peace and stability in Namibia will radically improve the situation in the south of Africa.

It is naive to think that everything will proceed smoothly. Much will depend on the conduct of the South African Government, on its readiness to refrain from the policy of aggression and interference in internal affairs of neighbouring countries as a means to ensure its own interests.

Namibia's decolonisation has always been linked to the problem of apartheid, Shevardnadze said. The apartheid policies in South Africa are the root cause of the conflicts in the south of Africa. A comprehensive settlement is impossible without the elimination of apartheid.

As long as apartheid exists, there will be a conflict situation in the region. The opposite is also true, Shevardnadze said.

He said he has no doubt that South Africa is following the events in Namibia closely and is looking for answers to questions, without which there can be no peace also in South Africa.

"One would like to believe that all South Africans, whites and blacks alike, will be able to feel equally free and secure in a truly democratic state built on the principles of non-racial society," Shevardnadze said.

East Europe

Reportage on Visit by Polish Premier Mazowiecki

Greeted by Ryzhkov on Arrival

LD2311172189 Moscow TASS in English 1706 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, arrived in Moscow for an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government this evening.

At the Vnukovo Airport he was met by Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and by other officials.

The programme of Mazowiecki's stay in the Soviet Union envisages conversations and negotiations with Soviet leaders, during which problems of bilateral cooperation and other questions of mutual interest will be discussed.

During the visit which is to last for five days the Polish premier will make trips to Smolensk and Leningrad. He will meet with representatives of various circles of the Soviet public.

Ryzhkov Makes Statement

LD0411040689 Warsaw PAP in English 0125 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 23—Polish Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki arrived in the Soviet Union for a four-day official visit in the evening today. This is the first visit of a noncommunist head of the Polish Government since World War Two.

Upon his arrival at Moscow's Vnukovo airport at 2000 hrs, Mazowiecki was greeted by Soviet Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov, as well as deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, co-chairman of the intergovernmental Soviet-Polish Commission of Economic Cooperation Stepan Sitaryan, the head of the office of the Council of Ministers Mikhail Shkabardnia, Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Konstantin Katushev, chairman of the state committee of the USSR for the protection of nature Nikolay Vorontsov, chairman of the State Committee

for Public Education Gennadiy Yagodin and other officials. Also present were Poland's ambassador to the Soviet Union Stanislaw Ciosek and his Soviet counterpart Vladimir Brovikov.

The Polish premier is accompanied by: Jacek Ambroziak: minister and head of the office of the Council of Ministers, Bronislaw Kaminski: minister of environmental protection and natural resources, Marcin Swiecicki: minister of foreign economic relations, Jerzy Osiatynski: minister and head of the Central Planning Office, Aleksander Hall: minister and member of the Council of Ministers, Tadeusz Syryjczyk: minister of industry, Boleslaw Kulski: secretary of state at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Marek Dabrowski: secretary of state at the Ministry of Finance, Waldemar Kuczynski: undersecretary of state at the office of the Council of Ministers, chairman of the premier's advisors, Andrzej Drawicz: chairman of the radio and television committee, and Malgorzata Niezabitowska: the government press spokeswoman.

Accompanied by Nikolay Ryzhkov, Mazowiecki left the airport for the representative "Oktyabrskaya" hotel near the Kremlin. The route covered by the motorcade was bedecked with Polish and Soviet flags.

Programme of the Visit

During his visit to the USSR, Tadeusz Mazowiecki will be received by Mikhail Gorbachev, will hold talks with Nikolay Ryzhkov and other representatives of the Soviet Government. He will meet also Professor Andrey Sakharov and other Soviet intellectuals. Mazowiecki will also meet Soviet Poles and will also be the first Polish leader to pay homage to the murdered Polish officers in Katyn. He will also visit Smolensk and Leningrad.

Both sides attach great importance to the visit and are also aware that it provides a historic opportunity for genuine reconciliation between the two peoples and expresses deideologization and demonopolization of Poland's relations with the USSR. International dimension of the visit is also equally great: It should be viewed as a confirmation in practice of a new doctrine now binding in the Soviet Union's policy towards countries of Eastern Europe. The doctrine is based on respect for their external sovereignty and domestic independence and this is of fundamental significance for the entirety of East-West relations.

Statement by Soviet Premier Ryzhkov for PAP

The PAP correspondent asked Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov to make a short statement. Asked what hopes he pinned on the commencing talks in which his partner, for the first time in Poland's postwar history, would be a man whom Poles addressed "Mr. Premier" rather than "Comrade Premier," Nikolay Ryzhkov answered.

"Firstly, I think that one of the most important tasks will be to get acquainted with each other. Secondly, our task will also be to examine from the state positions these problems and questions that must be solved by both the Soviet Union and Poland.

"We will firstly examine economic, scientific and technical questions, but also other issues that we take interest in. This concerns also international questions that we will discuss during our talks.

"I think that the visit and the talks will be fruitful and will give us an opportunity to solve these problems that arouse concern of Poland and the USSR."

Begins Talks With Ryzhkov

LD2411090589 Moscow TASS in English 0747 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov opened talks with his Polish counterpart Tadeusz Mazowiecki in the Kremlin today.

Mazowiecki arrived in Moscow on Thursday for an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

Lays Wreath at Tomb of Unknown Soldier

LD2411110789 Moscow TASS in English 1041 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—Visiting Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki placed a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier near the Kremlin Wall early on Friday and observed a minute's silence to remember Soviet soldiers killed in the Second World War.

He was accompanied by Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Nikolay Laverov.

Later in the day Mazowiecki was to have talks with Mikhail Gorbachev and Nikolay Ryzhkov and sign joint documents.

In the evening, the Soviet Government will host an official dinner in Mazowiecki's honour. Mazowiecki and Ryzhkov will make short speeches at the ceremony.

Mazowiecki Interviewed Prior to USSR Visit

LD2211122489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0900 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Interview with Polish Premier T. Mazowiecki by unidentified TASS correspondents in Warsaw; date of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Warsaw, 22 Nov (TASS)—In connection with his forthcoming official visit to the Soviet Union, T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Polish People's Republic, received TASS correspondents and replied to their questions.

[Question] What do you expect from your forthcoming visit to the USSR?

[Mazowiecki] There are many new things happening today in Poland and the Soviet Union. A clear understanding of our mutual aims is particularly important in such a situation. My forthcoming visit to Moscow will serve this purpose. My contacts in the Soviet Union will provide a good opportunity to establish links, primarily on the state level. I do not represent any party; I represent state authority. In my view, this must be the basis for the development of future contacts. It is precisely for this reason that mutual understanding is particularly important. I do not wish to say that other kinds of contacts are less important; however, state ties are fundamental.

It is the government's task, as I said in my program speech to the Sejm, to respect all alliance treaties. We wish to confirm that this is not an opportunistic or superficial element of our policy. It ensues from a profound understanding of what the alliance with the USSR represents for Poland, of what Polish-Russian (speaking from the historical perspective) and Polish-Soviet relations represent in the context of the present day and of their great importance. I would like my visit to confirm these intentions.

[Question] How do you view the prospects for the development of Polish-Soviet relations, specifically economic relations? What obstacles exist on the path of their development?

[Mazowiecki] I am sure that ways can be found to resolve quickly many of the economic, historical, and political issues which I would like to discuss in Moscow. We are now at a historical moment when it is becoming possible to ensure that our alliance rests on a broad public base. This is a very important matter. It is well-known that the foundations of this alliance are long-standing; however, at the social level not all its aspects have been fully understood. In such a situation, it is necessary that there be a basic conviction and a deeper recognition of the need for it, and for all this to be done with a sense of freedom of choice and not just on someone's orders.

I believe that in the present situation we can achieve this. The visit could be an important step in this direction. I would also like it to help to dispel the doubts which I think exist in certain Soviet circles about the stability of the situation in Poland and about whether it creates a threat to the situation in Europe and to our neighbors. We would like such doubts to be dispelled precisely because we are committed to cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Our efforts to step up economic cooperation and intensify contacts with the West will not mean that we will stop being committed to economic relations with our eastern neighbor. On the contrary, we believe that cooperation with the latter has broad, long-term prospects, and it should be regarded in just such terms.

As for obstacles to Polish-Soviet relations, a whole series of problems of the past need to be cleared up. Above all, this is a case of the "blank spots" in history. I think that this is extremely important. It is necessary for Poles who have suffered to be morally compensated, for respect to be paid to the memory of the dead, as has been done with regard to other people, and for these spots to be eliminated. This is highly important for our relations from the psychological point of view. Economic relations also need to be reformed on a modern-day basis using new forms of cooperation.

[Question] What are your comments on anti-Soviet incidents which have occurred recently?

[Mazowiecki] When speaking of a few recent anti-Soviet incidents, one must point out that the Government has regarded them very critically. But it would be wrong to make a problem, which would dominate in our relations, out of these individual phenomena, which are of a particularly alien nature. It is essential to look at them in proper perspective. One must understand that all of this is not some sort of anti-Soviet wave. There is no such wave. But if we are talking of political forces represented in parliament, first and foremost of the coalition, then it seems to me that here everyone understands the significance of the Polish-Soviet alliance. If we speak in regard to the government, I would like to recall that, for example, on the eve of 17 September it warned against any sort of incidents, so as not to make a pretext of this date for anti-Soviet actions.

[Question] Can help from the West be a decisive factor in overcoming the Polish crisis?

[Mazowiecki] Help to Poland from the West is something very important, but we must count on our own strength. Nothing will replace this. It is a matter of the maximum effectiveness of this help. But I repeat again: This can in no way replace our own labor and our own organization of labor. These contacts cannot, in any event, replace our commitment to economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and the CEMA member countries, although that institution itself needs to be reformed, and we agree with that.

Profiled by PRAVDA

PM2211165989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed profile: "On the Visit to the Soviet Union by Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers"]

[Text] Tadeusz Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, arrives in Moscow today on an official visit.

T. Mazowiecki was born in Plock 18 April 1927. He graduated from Warsaw University's Faculty of Law.

He was a member of Pax—a society of lay Catholics—and chief editor of the weekly WROCLAWSKI TYGODNIK KATOLICKI.

In 1956 he was one of the founders of the Warsaw Catholic Intelligentsia Club, subsequently becoming a board member and its deputy chairman. He was one of the creators and chief editor of the Catholic magazine WIEZ and a figure in the lay Catholics' movement Znak. He was a Polish Sejm deputy in 1961-1972.

In August 1980 he initiated an appeal from representatives of the intelligentsia in solidarity with the striking workers. He was chairman of the Interplant Strike Committee's Panel of Experts and a participant in the talks that worked out the Gdansk agreements.

Since 1980 he has been an adviser to the independent self-governing trade union "Solidarity." He was chief editor of the weekly SOLIDARNOSC before the introduction of martial law and when the newspaper resumed publication in 1989.

He was interned between December 1981 and December 1982. He has been a "Solidarity" adviser since 1987. He is a member of the Citizens' Committee under the chairman of the "Solidarity" Trade Union Association. He was one of the initiators of the "roundtable" talks and chairman of the Commission on Trade Union Pluralism.

He is the author of many publications, specifically "Crossroads and Values" and "Christians on Human Rights." He is a member of the "PEN" club and a winner of the Andrzej Strug Prize.

He is a widower with three grown sons and four grandsons.

The Polish Sejm appointed Tadeusz Mazowiecki chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers 24 August 1989.

T. Mazowiecki advocates good-neighborly and friendly relations with the Soviet Union and favors the development and strengthening of cooperation with the USSR in all spheres.

Soviet people welcome the visit to our country by T. Mazowiecki, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, and express confidence that his visit will promote the deepening of all-around cooperation between the USSR and Poland and the strengthening of friendship between the Soviet and Polish peoples.

Polish Ambassador Arrives in Moscow 21 Nov

PM2211191389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "In Brief"]

[Text] Polish Ambassador Stanislaw Ciosek arrived in Moscow 21 November.

Polish Government Denounces Lenin Monument Attack

LD2311113889 Moscow TASS in English 1127 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Warsaw November 23 TASS—The PAP NEWS AGENCY has circulated a statement by the Polish Government press secretary. It reads:

"A monument to Lenin was set on fire in Nova Huta near Krakow. This is an act of vandalism. Moreover, this action smacks of a political provocation on the eve of the Polish Prime Minister Tadeusz Mazowiecki's visit to Moscow and should be resolutely denounced.

"The provincial procurator's office in Krakow has begun an investigation."

Reportage on CSSR Unrest, Government Reaction

Government Said Ready for Dialogue

PM2211190989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS correspondent V. Yaroshevskiy special dispatch for IZVESTIYA: "Alarm and Hope of the Prague Fall"]

[Text] Prague—The rally held in Wenceslas Square in downtown Prague on 21 November differed from the previous rally not only in being larger, but in its new political overtones. For the first time banners appeared proclaiming "Workers are here in the square!" and "The workers support the students!" I do not think that they comprised a significant section of the demonstration, in which 250,000 people took part, but they were there nonetheless.

One's attention was also drawn to the banner stating "The Soviet Union is our example at last." Incidentally, I repeatedly saw anti-Soviet banners being carried by the demonstrators. Yesterday, for the first time in the past 3 days, the rally participants were addressed (a microphone had been installed in the square) by representatives of so-called independent initiatives. A new informal association called the "Citizens' Forum" has appeared in Prague. Its aims were related by the writer and playwright Vaclav Havel, one of the leaders of the Czechoslovak opposition. It is not a political party but a "community open to all people of good will who feel responsible for positively resolving the crisis in the country."

Shortly before the rally, CSSR Premier Ladislav Adamec met with student representatives and representatives of the capital's youth, creative, and social organizations. The head of the government shared his ideas about the progress of perestroyka and stressed that it needs to be spread to society's political life too. The government is prepared to accept any practical advice from anyone interested in the renewal of socialism. "But we will defend socialism," L. Adamec said, "that is not a subject for discussion."

It was stated at the meeting that the protests, demonstrations, and strike calls have appeared as a result of the inappropriate [neadekvatnyy] actions taken by the law-enforcement organs against the student demonstration in Prague. The CSSR prosecutor general has been instructed to carry out a thoroughgoing investigation into what happened. The meeting marked the start of dialogue with the authorities, the Czechoslovak newspapers are noting. I discovered somewhat to my surprise that they have become more interesting to read: They are no longer "faces wearing the same expression." Pluralism of opinions has crossed over into the newspapers.

Apartment block walls in central Prague are festooned with leaflets. Provocative proclamations signed by the "Mlada Levitse" [name as transliterated] organization have even appeared. The capital's students have been dissociating themselves from this organization: "Do not respond to calls to 'beat up Communists' under any circumstances! We have a different objective. Young people are categorically opposed to any violence, because they have experienced it at first hand. Unmask the agent provocateurs!"

Prague CPCZ, Adamec Appeal for Calm

PM2211185789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 First Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Vtorushin dispatch: "Demonstrations Continue"]

[Text] Prague, 22 Nov—Strikes and student demonstrations continue in the Czechoslovak capital and a number of other cities. Almost all theaters remain closed. Around 150,000 people gathered in Prague's central square yesterday evening. The demonstrators called for a frank dialogue with the country's leadership, the democratization of society, and the holding of free elections.

A plenum of Prague Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] City Committee was held yesterday. Its participants issued a statement on the sociopolitical situation in the capital. It states, in particular:

We are experiencing a serious period. The program of perestroyka and democratization begun at the CPCZ's initiative is in jeopardy. The cause of the working people and the cause of socialism, for which previous generations made sacrifices and immense efforts and with which the overwhelming majority of Prague people's lives are linked—not least those of students, young people, and cultural figures—are at stake.

The plenum participants called on Prague people not to succumb to emotion but to continue to be a firm link in the struggle for perestroyka and democratization.

Yesterday Federal Premier Ladislav Adamec met with representatives of the public, including workers, students, and arts figures. He stated that he had instructed the CSSR prosecutor general to investigate the circumstances surrounding the events of 17 November, during which several students were injured by the security organs. Our meeting, Ladislav Adamec said, is concrete proof that the federal government is not avoiding dialogue. There are no issues which cannot be raised. At the same time, he stressed that the dialogue about society's serious problems must not be conducted on the streets. He called on students and cultural figures to return to their lecture halls and to reopen the theaters.

The newspaper RUDE PRAVO has published a large selection of letters from readers from various parts of the country. Expressing their disagreement with the security forces' actions 17 November, they all state that the destabilization of the political situation can only harm all of society. It could halt perestroyka and hinder social change.

Students Seek Worker Support for Strike

PM2311183189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS correspondent V. Yaroshevskiy special dispatch for IZVESTIYA: "Extraordinary CPCZ Central Committee Plenum Being Convened"]

[Text] Prague—How many demonstrators gathered in Wenceslas Square 22 November?—100,000, 200,000, or maybe more? The Czechoslovak newspapers, in order to avoid differing accounts, stated "thousands" in their reports. But this report is about something else. There are still lawns in the middle of the square. Not one of the aforesaid thousands even stepped on these islands of greenery, although there wasn't even room to swing a cat in the square. This seemingly insignificant detail nonetheless demonstrates a very important point—the standard of behavior, for instance.

The gigantic meetings are being held in an organized fashion. And although waves of emotion and feeling have repeatedly swept through central Prague during these November days, law and order has remained unchanged, and has been maintained by the rally participants themselves. We can only envy the discipline and dignified behavior of the Prague people.

Activists from the "Civic Forum" again addressed those present. Vaclav Havel promised to bring together within the next few hours all the demands made by the public. Maybe we will witness the formation of a mass political platform. A message to informal groups in the GDR, Poland, the Soviet Union, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Romania was read out. The "Civic Forum" expressed its gratitude to its foreign allies for their solidarity and support. The crowd greeted these words with undisguised approval. Currently only one side is conducting direct, one-on-one discussions with the demonstrators. RUDE PRAVO has expressed perplexity and concern in this regard. The newspaper stated that the Communist Party's voice is not very audible at this testing time. I believe many people want to hear it. At any rate, the first steps toward mutual understanding and consolidation have been taken.

The CSSR National Front Central Committee Presidium yesterday issued a principled statement: Painful problems can only be solved in open dialogue, but there can be no dialogue without taking account of alternate opinions or respecting opposite views.

This constructive position was supported at a meeting of the leaders of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] and the Czechoslovak Socialist Party. The meeting was held yesterday, and that was no coincidence. The fact is that the Czechoslovak Socialist Party was the first party in the CSSR National Front to make a principled assessment of the 17 November events.

Meanwhile, the student strike goes on and a Czechoslovak higher education students' strike committee has been set up to coordinate the actions of strike committees across the republic. Delegations of young people have been sent to plants to encourage the workers to take part in a general strike 27 November. In some places they have been supported, in other places they have not even been allowed across the threshold—perhaps within the framework of a pluralism of actions. But, on the whole, the workers' opinion has been that the strike will have a pernicious effect on the economy, which is currently having a hard time of it.

The CPCZ Central Committee Presidium has adopted a resolution to convene an extraordinary plenum of the party's Central Committee 24 November.

Jakes Sees Need for Reforms

LD2311000189 Moscow TASS in English 1654 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Prague November 22 TASS—Milos Jakes, the Czechoslovak party leader, appeared on Czechoslovak television in connection with student demonstrations in Prague and other towns.

Addressing the citizens of Czechoslovakia, he said that "our society is at the crossroads of its development. We are fully aware that socialism's further development in Czechoslovakia cannot proceed without reforms. We shall not deviate from the course to improve the people's living standards.

"We, like you, want the reforms to yield quick and tangible results," Jakes said. "We realise that the necessary changes should not backfire at the working people, should not affect their social status, and that we bear responsibility for this. Our programme opposes anarchy, social tension and social corruption. All this could seriously damage our national interests.

"Together with all honest citizens we must proceed along our own, Czechoslovak road of social renovation, meeting our national and democratic traditions and corresponding to our nation's industriousness, talent and cultural standards. We are prepared to start a dialogue with everybody who stands for socialism.

"Problems troubling our people and the new tasks confronting them now can be solved only through constructive, businesslike negotiatons, through an open and responsible discussion of different alternatives. They can be solved if we are ready to heed each other's views.

"The restructuring process naturally engenders different views and positions. But there are limits which should not be overstepped. They are laid down by our constitution and the laws of our socialist state. And this is democratic.

"What groups are behind current events in Prague and what is their programme? They are trying to shamelessly manipulate some of our young people and to speculate on their sincere desire to accelerate reforms. They have influenced some of our intellectuals too.

"What are the moral qualities of people who shamelessly circulate rumours about the death of a young man for the only purpose of stirring up emotions? Under reformist and democratic slogans, these people act against the interests of the people and of the socialist system in Czechoslovakia. Friday's events on the national boulevard are often discussed in this context. As you know, they will be investigated. One thing is clear: The cause of the working people and of socialism with which most of our nation, including the young people, link their future is at stake. [no end quotation marks as received]

In conclusion Jakes called on the citizens of Czechoslovakia to display civic responsibility, wisdom and sobermindedness and to defend the values of socialism.

TASS on 23 Nov Protest, CPCZ Plenum

LD2411113989 Moscow TASS in English 1123 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Prague November 24 TASS—By TASS correspondents Valeriy Rzhevskiy and Vitaliy Yaroshevskiy:

Massive demonstrations continue in Prague and other towns of Czechoslovakia. Up to 500,000 people gathered in Wenceslas Square and nearby streets on Thursday [23 November] afternoon. The speakers again demanded radical sociopolitical and democratic reforms and called for a general strike on November 27.

According to reports coming in here, some 500 enterprises and organisations have already supported the call to go on strike.

The crisis has split Czechoslovak society. This is borne out by the content of the adopted resolutions and statements, and by the contradictory views on key problems requiring urgent solution.

A meeting of senior officers and political workers of the Czechoslovak People's Army was held on Thursday. It issued a statement supporting the efforts of the party Central Committee, government and most working collectives to overcome the difficult sociopolitical situation.

"The Army relies on support of the people. Together with workers, farmers and intellectuals, we are prepared to defend the gains of socialism, to uphold freedom and peace," the statement notes.

Party and youth organisations of the National Security Corps of the Ninth Prague District demanded that the Presidium of the Czechoslovak Communist Party should not sidestep unresolved political and other problems, and should not lay the blame for the November 17 events on the security forces.

Their resolution, published by the MLADA FRONTA newspaper, calls for a plenary meeting of the Central Committee and for personnel changes in the party leadership in order to make the party efficient again.

An extraordinary plenum of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee was convened today to discuss the current political situation. Addressing a meeting at the CKD-Sokolovo plant yesterday, Miroslav Stepan, member of the Communist Party Central Committee Presidium and Prague party chief, said that the plenum would make certain personnel changes which, however, would not be as a result of outside pressure.

'Crisis of Confidence' in CSSR Leaders

PM2311195989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 89 First Edition p 7

[Own correspondent S. Vtorushin dispatch: "For an Open Dialogue"]

[Text] Prague, 23 Nov—The wave of student demonstrations and strikes that started in the Czechoslovak capital and then spread to virtually the entire country is not diminishing. Yesterday Prague high school and vocational and technical college students became involved.

Creative organizations are expressing support for the students' actions. A rally of more than 100,000 people has been held in Wenceslas Square. Its participants—and they included many representatives of other sections of society aside from the students—carried banners bearing sometimes mutually exclusive slogans.

The movement which has rocked the country is not homogeneous. However, the overwhelming majority of rally participants agree on one thing: The problems cannot be solved by force or the use of police nightsticks. Society needs reasonable dialogue more than ever. It is very important that each side not only be able to express its views but also be capable of hearing out the other side. The call for an open dialogue among all participants is the demand heard most often.

Federal Premier Ladislav Adamec had talks with the leaders of the Czechoslovak Writers' Union in Prague yesterday. Miroslav Stepan, first secretary of Prague Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] City Committee and concurrently chairman of the National Front City Committee, discussed topical problems with Cardinal Tomasek. As was noted, this was the first-ever meeting between the Archbishop of Prague and the leader of Prague's Communists. Yesterday there was an exchange of opinions between the leaders of the CPCZ and the Czechoslovak Socialist Party. A session of the National Front Central Committee Presidium was held. The aim of these meetings and sessions is to make a more accurate assessment of the prevailing situation and find the best way out of the situation.

And that situation is difficult. Society clearly has a crisis of confidence in the leadership. Many people are no longer prepared to settle for words and resolutions which are not always carried out. They are demanding concrete action and vigorous steps to improve the social situation in the country. At the same time, many people—primarily workers—clearly realize that the destabilization of the political situation inevitably will affect the national economy and working people's economic position. The overwhelming majority of them oppose the general strike intended for 27 November—calls for which are frequently being voiced at the rallies.

Society is at a crossroads. It is now clear that people were not brought out onto the streets solely by the actions of Western subversion centers—on which attention had always been focused—but also by the accumulation of home-grown problems. A CPCZ Central Committee plenum to examine the domestic political situation is scheduled for 24 November.

CPCZ's Jakes, Socialist Leader Meet

LD2311142589 Moscow TASS in English 1356 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Prague November 23 TASS—Czechoslovak Communist Party senior officials, led by party leader Milos Jakes, have met Czechoslovak Socialist Party Chairman Bohuslav Kucera and Party Central Committee Presidium members here.

The meeting focused on the country's complicated political situation, the CTK NEWS AGENCY reports. After lively discussion the sides concluded that a press statement issued by the Czechoslovak National Front Central Committee Presidium formed the basis for improving the state of affairs.

The document states that the changes expected by society are not yet being put into life promptly and efficiently, says the document, which is of fundamental significance, according to mass media.

The possibilities for citizens involvement in political activities have not yet been used to their fullest extent. The solution of problems is possible only through an open dialogue of the whole society, allowing for alternative proposals and opposite viewpoints.

Newspapers report the convocation of a Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee plenary meeting on Friday, November 24. The young people's mistrust of

communists should enable them to maintain a business-like and sober appraisal of the party's policy, the newspaper RUDE PRAVO wrote.

Calls for a general strike on Monday, November 27, are still being made. Students are sending delegations to plants, not only in Prague, to get workers' support. So far they have met with small success, although some enterprises supported the student call in their resolutions.

But on the whole the working class thinks that a strike now would be detrimental to the economy which is experiencing difficulties. There is no time to strike, it is necessary to both work and examine the causes that led society into the crisis.

The Presidium of the Czechoslovak Journalists' Union Central Committee issued a statement denouncing the fact that, contrary to journalists' ethics, some people are spreading false information and relying on Western press reports. They are heightening tension at a time when a sober appraisal of the state of affairs in the interests of the people is needed.

"We demand that journalists be guaranteed broad access to information from all competent agencies in order to provide a truthful and efficient coverage of all aspects of society's life," the statement says.

The Presidium of the Journalists' Union Central Committee demanded that the Federal Assembly submit the bill on the press for nationwide discussion.

The demonstration held in Prague's central and adjacent districts is described by the Czechoslovak press as the largest one in history. Its participants were unanimous in their determination to extricate the country out of the crisis. The demonstrators were again addressed by representatives of the Civil Forum, which recenty came to the fore.

Following numerous speeches, which lasted for an hour, demonstrators started leaving the square. Some remained until late at night, forming discussion groups.

The mass meeting was held in a calm atmosphere without incident.

Dubcek Warns Rally Against Extremism

LD2411113389 Moscow TASS in English 2240 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Bratislava November 24 TASS—A rally in downtown Bratislava on Thursday [23 November] drew several tens of thousands of people, mainly youth. Numerous streamers before the rostrum called for unity, democracy, free elections, changes in the personnel policy, strict punishment of those guilty for the November 17 events in Prague, truthful coverage of the situation in the country by the media.

The main slogan of the rally was access to television and the press, said Milan Knazko, an actor, who opened the rally.

He said that 36 various organisations in Slovakia supported the demands advanced by public against violence committee formed two days ago.

The CTK news agency reports that Alexander Dubcek addressed the rally. He called for renewal of society.

Everyone should participate in the public movement against violence, he said.

Dubcek called on young people to remain calm and warned them against making extremist demands which might lead to tragic consequences.

A plenum of the Bratislava City Committee of the Communist Party was held on Thursday. It noted that the sincere striving of young people to participate in the solution of complex problems of public life degenerated under the impact of undesirable emotions and other interests into numerous street rallies and calls to involve enterprises and citizens in a general strike.

"Manifestations taking place now have nothing in common either with a dialogue, or with perestroyka, or with democracy, or students. Young people should realise this. This is a prelude to the struggle for political power," says the statement of the Bratislava City committee of the party.

CPCZ Central Committee Session Opens

LD2411101889 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Prague November 24 TASS—An extraordinary plenary meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia opened here today. It is discussing the current political situation in the country.

The Czechoslovak news service reports that the plenum was opened by Milos Jakes, general secretary of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee.

Czechoslovak Army Supports CPCZ Policy

LD2411091789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] As reported by the CTK agency, a meeting of the aktiv of the Supreme Command Staff and political workers of the Czechoslovak People's Army has been held in Prague. Its participants adopted a statement which states in part: Representatives of the Czechoslovak People's Army view with concern the events currently taking place in our country. We reject the anarchy being sown by external and internal antisocialist forces. We actively support the efforts of the Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] Central Commitee, the federal and national governments, and the majority of our working people, which are aimed at overcoming the complex sociopolitical situation, at establishing calm and order, and at creating the conditions for creative

dialogue. We reject the confrontation of forces. We support the implementation of the adopted program of perestroyka.

Paper Condemns 1968 Invasion of Czechoslovakia

AU2211125389 Vienna ORF Teletext in German 1226 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Excerpt] Moscow—[Passage omitted] In an "open letter to friends in Prague" published by the liberal weekly MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI today, Member of Parliament Granin compared the reforms introduced under then party chief Dubcek with the course of perestroyka under Gorbachev. Granin writes that the CSSR's wish at that time to develop a "socialism with a human face" was "the first perestroyka": "We destroyed and slandered them—it was collective murder."

CSSR Foreign Minister Receives Soviet Envoy

LD2311190289 Prague Domestic Service in Czech 1800 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Today, at Cernin Palace in Prague, CSSR Foreign Minister Jaromir Johanes received the Soviet Ambassador to the CSSR, Viktor Lomakin. They talked about mutual cooperation in implementing restructuring and democratization in the two countries and about some international questions.

Gorbachev 'Adviser' Cited on CSSR, GDR

LD2311132389 Belgrade TANJUG in English 1223 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Rome, November 23 (TANJUG)—Developments similar to those which have taken place in the German Democratic Republic are "imminent" in Czechoslovakia, where the power of the authorities "has been weakened," according to Yevgeniy Ambarzumov, adviser to Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev.

Ambarzumov will accompany the Soviet state and party leader during his visit to Italy and the meeting with U.S. President George Bush aboard naval ships off Malta.

Judging from what Ambarzumov said in an interview published in the Turin daily LA STAMPA, the Soviet leader will let know his Italian hosts and the White House chief that the Kremlin's position on the reforms in the East "is not propagandist but strategic." Gorbachev will, according to Ambarzumov, present to his partners in talks his plans for a restructuring of relations with the socialist countries "on the basis of authentic independence."

Krenz Says SED Willing To Give Up Leading Role

LD2411114489 Moscow TASS in English 1108 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Berlin, 24 Nov, TASS—The GDR news agency ADN reports: GDR Party Ready To Analyse Mistakes. Wants Renewal, Says Krenz [ADN headline]

Berlin (ADN)—Egon Krenz, general secretary of the GDR's Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED), has said a special party congress, due in mid-December, must "put the whole truth on the table" about past mistakes in the country.

"The (SED) wants thorough and honest analysis of causes, mistakes and shortcomings, it wants a profound renewal and a socialism in which the people is the sole sovereign," Krenz said in an interview [word indistinct] newspaper NEUES DEUTSCHLAND on Friday [24 November].

"We are not a corrupt party," he said. The party would bring to book those responsible for the current situation—individuals, the old Politburo or the Central Committee, "those who infringed the law must be tried."

Krenz said many of the party's 2.3 million members had left in bitterness. "It is topical to gain new trust through renewal of the party." The vital principle of unity must never again be abused "in devotion to a single person or a small group."

The past must never be repeated, he said, the core of the national crisis was that the party had failed to come to terms with the Stalinist past. Reforms in the Soviet Union could have been of much more use for the GDR if the latter had in time recognized this development and drawn appropriate conclusions.

The SED wanted a socialism putting man at its centre and fully revealing its essence as the humanist alternative to capitalism, Krenz said. It was for removing the passage in Article One of the GDR Constitution which lays down the party's leading role. Such a role had been earned through hard work, efficiency and firmness.

The party would never again restrain the sovereign rights of parliament and the government by issuing mandatory directives to them. It was for ending the intertwinement of party, state and economy.

It would, however, assert its role in public life "according to its capacity and with all energy. After all, we represent a considerable part of the people, especially the working class."

The new democratic nature of the party congress would result in a Central Committee "really trusted by the delegates and thus the rank and file. The congress would also decide on fundamental principles of a new party constitution including the limitation of tenures of party offices at all levels. [no end quote marks as received]

SED Commission To Investigate Honecker

LD2311222389 Moscow TASS in English 2117 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Berlin in November 24 TASS—The Central Control Commission of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] met in Berlin on Thursday. The meeting was conducted by its chairman and Politburo Member Werner Eberlein.

The commission discussed the preparation for the Party's emergency congress and investigation into the activities of those who are responsible for the current situation in the Party and the country.

The commission expelled former Politburo Member and Central Committee Secretary Guenter Mittag from the Party. An investigation has also been launched into Erich Honecker. The commission took into account doctors' report that Honecker's health was too poor to give the necessary evidence.

GDR's Modrow Cited on Kohl-Krenz Talks

LD2211150989 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—"The meeting between Egon Krenz and Helmut Kohl, due in the next fortnight, in which I shall also take part, is expected to help elaborate common approaches to the development of the GDR-FRG relations," Hans Modrow, the German Democratic Republic's new prime minister, said in an interview with NOVOSTI press agency, printed in the newspaper SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA today.

"When we speak of the GDR's and FRG's common resonsibility, we primarily imply the fact that both German states bear special responsibility for the preservation of peace in Europe. This question concerns not only the German Democratic Republic and West Germany. It also concerns the security interests of the Soviet Union and our other Warsaw Treaty allies. Herein lies our responsibility above all. The GDR and the FRG belong to different blocs—the Warsaw Treaty Organization and NATO—and nobody can ignore that," he said.

"Relations with the USSR are of vital significance to us, as is reflected in the government's statement. The relations with the USSR should be developed to as great extent as possible," Modrow said.

Vorotnikov Continues Visit to Romania

Meets With Ceausescu

PM2211185189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Official Reports"]

[Text] Bucharest, 22 Nov—N. Ceausescu, general secretary of the Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Central Committee and Romanian president, today [as published] received V.I. Vorotnikov, leader of the CPSU delegation to the 14th RCP Congress, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, and chairman of the Presidium of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet.

Addresses Romanian Friendship Rally

PM2311115189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[Unnamed PRAVDA and TASS special correspondents dispatch: "Soviet-Romanian Friendship Rally"]

[Text] Bucharest, 22 Nov—A CPSU delegation headed by V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, which is taking part in the work of the 14th Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Congress, visited the city of Tirgoviste, the administrative center of Dimbovita Judet, where it had a conversation at the RCP judet committee.

Tirgoviste is well known in Romania for its history and its cultural monuments. Set at the intersection of important trade routes, it was the capital of Romania in the distant past.

During the years of socialism the city has assumed a new complexion. The changes have not only affected its architectural appearance. A major industrial base has sprung up here. Tirgoviste is now described as the industrial stronghold of Romania. The special steel metallurgical combine holds a leading place in its economy. Its construction was begun almost 20 years ago during the accelerated industrialization of the republic.

The enterprise's 9,000-strong collective is trying not to discredit its trademark. The engineers and workers could probably achieve higher quantitative and qualitative indicators were it not for the shortage of raw materials and electricity. But it is not only the people of Tirgoviste who are facing this problem today. The fact that the combine's equipment is not operating at full capacity —it is producing 700,000 tonnes of steel instead of its rated capacity of 1 million tonnes—is quite typical of Romania's major industrial enterprises.

It was quite natural for our delegation to visit this metallurgical center. It supplies the USSR with 10,000 tonnes of steel annually. Questions of supplies of USSR equipment for a new rolling mill are being studied.

A Romanian-Soviet friendship rally took place at the enterprise club. N. Sasu, secretary of the enterprise party committee and chairman of the collective labor council, who spoke at it, talked about the long traditions of friendship and cooperation linking the Romanian and Soviet peoples.

Then V.I. Vorotnikov addressed the rally.

Dear Comrades!

We members of the CPSU delegation are glad of this opportunity to meet you, workers and employees, at the special alloy combine.

Allow me first to convey to you a friendly greeting from the Soviet leadership and from the Soviet Union's working people.

Our delegation has come to your country at the invitation of the RCP Central Committee. We are taking part as guests in the work of the 14th RCP Congress, which is examining fundamental questions relating to the party's activity and the tasks facing the Romanian people in the economic and social development of the country. We wholeheartedly wish you success and wish your homeland progress and prosperity.

Following the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum, our country embarked on the path of improving socialist relations in all spheres of public life. We call this process perestroyka. Its aim is to give socialism new energy and to reveal its constructive capacities and its great humanistic potential more fully. Soviet people's efforts are concentrated on making society more dynamic and more democratic and making the economy more effective and more receptive to scientific and technical progress, geared to the resolution of social tasks and the satisfaction of people's needs.

The reform of the political system is an important part of perestroyka. It aims to strengthen the rule-of-law state, develop democracy, and broaden the real power of the soviets, which V.I. Lenin proclaimed the foundation of our state.

In the course of perestroyka, substantial changes are taking place in Soviet society. Economic reform is developing, political structures are being renewed, and people's social activeness is increasing.

A new supreme organ of legislative power—the Congress of USSR People's Deputies—has been formed in our country and the functions of the USSR Supreme Soviet have changed. An effective mechanism is being set up to ascertain, take into consideration, and integrate the interests of various population strata and groups.

The people's spiritual life has also been enriched. Topical problems of social development are being discussed extensively from various viewpoints and a creative quest is underway for the most effective means of resolving the tasks facing the country today.

These are all indisputable gains of perestroyka.

But there is also another side to the coin. Uneven economic development, shortages of commodities on the consumer market, and the state budget deficit are all also present-day realities.

The main reason for this is the fact that past shortcomings have still not been fully overcome, old, ineffectual management methods are still in use, while the new ones which we are taking on board have still not really begun to work.

In order to overcome the difficulties that have arisen we must step up party organizations' organizational efforts, boost people's production activeness and the effectiveness of their labor, and consistently improve economic relations and the political mechanism.

The USSR Supreme Soviet is now discussing a package of important laws—on ownership, land and land use, the lease and lease relations, a unified tax system, the socialist enterprise, and local self-management. These laws are designed to help develop diverse forms of socialist ownership and economic activity. We are convinced that the interaction of and competition between these forms will help boost the Soviet economy splendidly.

True, you do sometimes hear it said that we are almost abandoning our socialist principles and ideals. This bears no relation to the facts. On the contrary, it is through renewed economic forms that we want to make better use of the tremendous potential enshrined in socialist ownership and socialist production relations and make man the master of production. We are developing purely socialist forms of ownership, we will not accept private ownership of the means of production, we will not accept hired labor, and we reject man's exploitation of man. We want to create the conditions which show in their entirety all the best things created by the socialist system and ensure that its lasting humanist values determine people's actions and thoughts.

We have our problems in the sphere of interethnic relations. It became necessary to substantially renew our nationalities policy and find ways to consolidate our union that are acceptable to all. That is what the CPSU Central Committee September Plenum did when it adopted the party platform on the nationalities question. On its basis the sovereignty of the union republics will gain real content and all the other national formations—autonomous republics, national oblasts and okrugs—will acquire broader rights. They will be able to more effectively resolve their own political, economic, and cultural problems.

Important changes are also taking place in the largest Soviet republic—the Russian Federation. Its sovereignty is being strengthened and new political and economic management structures are being created to promote the comprehensive development of the Russian peoples and the growth of the economy and culture.

I particularly want to mention the fact that perestroyka is being accompanied by the increased dynamism of our policy in the world arena. We are striving to promote the consolidation in international relations of the principles of equal rights, mutual benefit, and noninterference in the internal affairs of other states and peoples.

The transformations underway in the USSR and the new political thinking on international affairs are, in our view, having a beneficial effect on the situation in the world and are promoting the strengthening of security and trust. There have been perceptible improvements in the disarmament process. In this context I should like to recall that a whole class of nuclear weapons—intermediate- and shorter-range missiles—has been scrapped. The prospects for a 50-percent reduction in the strategic nuclear arsenals are taking real shape. Mention should also be made of the considerable progress toward the solution of the acute question of eliminating chemical weapons. More favorable opportunities are appearing in Europe for the development of economic and environmental cooperation and collaboration in the humanitarian and information spheres.

There is an increasing desire for open, honest dialogue, the rejection of prejudice and enmity, the broadening of the exchange of ideas, and free contact among people. That is the best way to achieve mutual understanding among the peoples.

Of course, we harbor no illusions about the irreversibility of the changes that have taken place. We must be aware that in order to create an all-embracing system of international security much work remains to be done.

We value the friendship and cooperation relations between the CPSU and the RCP and between our countries' peoples. The guidelines for their development are determined during summit meetings and talks between Comrades M.S. Gorbachev and N. Ceausescu. In the more than 40 years since the war, the foundations of Soviet-Romanian cooperation have been reinforced, economic and cultural ties are growing and strengthening year by year, and millions of Soviet and Romanian citizens are linked by reciprocal feelings of friendship.

Indeed, quite a lot has already been done. With regard to our bilateral trade we are accustomed to a trade turnover expressed in billions of rubles and output expressed in millions of tonnes. Romanian machines and equipment are working at many enterprises and construction sites in the USSR, and large economic facilities in Romania are equipped with Soviet-made machine tools and installations.

As Romanian comrades note, supplies of Soviet fuel and raw materials play an important role in satisfying your country's energy needs. They constitute two-thirds of our total exports to Romania. Romania, in turn, supplies the drilling and other petroleum equipment that our industry needs. Many types of consumer goods are also in mutual demand in our countries.

There are many goods things to say about economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and Romania. But it would probably be better to consider whether we have done all that we can in this respect and whether we are not lagging behind the demands of the time and the dynamic development of production forces in the modern world. I think that I am expressing the common opinion when I say that we must both be more courageous in introducing new forms of cooperation, more rapidly unravel the knot of problems which hamper economic initiative and enterprise, and constantly try to improve the quality of output.

The expansion of cooperation between the Soviet Union and Romania meets the interests of our countries' peoples. We consistently advocate its all-around development and are ready to go with you further along this road.

Allow me to wish you, the communists, and all the citizens of Romania great successes, peace, and happiness.

On the delegation's behalf, allow me to present a gift to your enterprise—a bust of the founder of the CPSU and the Soviet state, Vladimir Ilich Lenin.

Comrade V.I. Vorotnikov's speech was listened to attentively and repeatedly interrupted by applause.

Ceausescu Report at RCP Congress Viewed

PM2211150989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 First Edition p 4

[Report by unnamed PRAVDA and TASS special correspondents: "Important Landmark. 14th RCP Congress Continues Work"]

[Text] Bucharest, 21 Nov—As already reported, at the 14th Romanian Communist Party [RCP] Congress, which is taking place here, RCP General Secretary N. Ceausescu delivered the Central Committee's report on the present stage of Romanian socialist society, the Central Committee's activity since the 13th congress, and the fulfillment of the directive program for Romania's socioeconomic development during the Ninth 5-Year Plan and its long-term development through 2000-2010.

The 14th RCP Congress, he said, is a momentous event in Romania's history, in the activity of the revolutionary workers movement and our party, in general socioeconomic development, and in the successful building of a comprehensively developed socialist society.

As is well known, a broad democratic discussion was held by the entire party together with the whole people in the last 18 months, and everything that has been done by our people during the years of socialist building was analyzed in the course of this discussion. In all, more than 615,000 party members spoke and 462,160 proposals were made at primary party organization meetings, which were attended by virtually all party members, and at party conferences at enterprises and institutions and in villages and cities.

As a result of the victory won 45 years ago by the anti-imperialist social and national liberation revolution in Romania, foreign domination was eliminated forever

and the way was paved for profound revolutionary transformations and the building of socialism.

It is well known that a series of erroneous concepts emerged during the initial period, the strength and abilities of the working class and the Romanian people were underestimated, and serious mistakes and breaches of socialist legality which caused great damage to our motherland's socialist development were committed.

Citing generalized indicators of Romania's socioeconomic development in 1945-1990, the speaker noted that they confirm the correctness of the Ninth RCP Congress decisions and directives. Reality has refuted the concept of the past—which, nevertheless, had supporters during the years of socialist building—that Romania ought to remain a strictly agrarian country, and also the backward reactionary concept that the Romanian people are supposedly incapable of creating developed industry. Thus over 650 billion lei were allocated to agriculture between 1965 and 1990. This provided the basis for implementing a program of irrigation, land reclamation, and the provision of tractors and other agricultural equipment. The result was that this year's grain harvest of over 60 million tonnes was the largest ever in Romania's history.

As a result of the overall development of productive forces, national wealth in 1990 will reach about 5,660 billion lei as against 252 billion lei in 1945 and 810 billion lei in 1965. Thousands of plants and factories have been commissioned. The goal pursued in siting them was to accelerate the pace of development of backward zones, and this helped raise the level of socioeconomic development in all judets.

The allocation of approximately 67-70 percent of national income to the consumption fund made it possible to increase the labor remuneration fund by a factor of more than 33 compared with 1950. This provided the basis for ensuring almost tenfold growth in average wages. Retail trade turnover will reach approximately 315 billion lei this year, which will be 18.5 times more than in 1950.

Special attention was paid to housing construction. Approximately 3 million apartments have been commissioned, 2.6 million of them since 1965. Over 80 percent of the country's population now live in new homes.

As a result of all socioeconomic activity, national income has increased more than 40 times over compared to 1945.

This socioeconomic development created the conditions necessary for the improvement of financial and economic activity and the repayment of the entire external debt by the end of March this year. For the first time ever in its history Romania has neither debts nor interest charges to pay.

Now, when summing up the overall results of our socialist society's present stage of development and the results of the Eighth 5-Year Plan, we can declare with justified pride that the basic tasks of the party program for this period and the strategic tasks laid down by the 13th party congress are being successfully fulfilled. By the early nineties Romania will have joined the ranks of averagely developed countries.

While noting the major achievements in the building of socialism and our motherland's overall development, it must be openly said that the path to them has not been easy. We have had to overcome numerous inevitable difficulties and the certain backwardness of our country when we started.

The 14th party congress marks Romania's transition to a new stage of development, to the implementation of the highest phase of the program for building a comprehensively developed socialist society and creating the necessary conditions for implementing communist principles of labor and life.

Proceeding from the present level of the development of industry, agriculture, and other sectors, the emphasis in the next 5-year plan and in the long term through 2000-2010 will be placed on the intensification of development and the attainment of new qualities of labor and life and of an increasingly high level of all production on the basis of the introduction of the latest achievements of science and technology.

Dwelling on the indicators of Romania's development during the Ninth 5-Year Plan, N. Ceausescu noted that special attention must be given to the accelerated development of the country's own raw materials and energy sources base.

During the Ninth 5-Year Plan and in the long term, all activity will focus on the development and modernization of agriculture. It is necessary to ensure successful fulfillment of the irrigation and land reclamation program so as to ensure the irrigation of at least 6 million hectares by 1995, and to complete by the year 2000 the organization of a full national irrigation system covering approximately 7-7.5 million hectares of agricultural land. Special attention must continue to be paid to stockraising.

It is necessary to proceed from the premise, the RCP general secretary pointed out, that we must ensure Romania's even more active participation in the international division of labor. During the Ninth 5-Year Plan our foreign trade volume must show an increase of approximately 55-60 percent over the Eighth 5-Year Plan.

Our country will continue to focus its activity on economic, scientific, and technical cooperation with all socialist countries. Noting CEMA's important role, we are ready to play an active part in improving its activity and implementing long-term programs through the year 2000, including those in the science and technology sphere. We believe that the CEMA countries have major

opportunities to expand cooperation and to jointly solve various problems of socioeconomic development.

It is necessary to ensure that CEMA and all the socialist countries in general examine more thoroughly the questions of overcoming the current difficulties and, through closer cooperation, ensure progress and enhancement of their peoples' material and spiritual living standards.

N. Ceausescu went on to point out Romania's determination to strengthen collaboration with the socialist countries' armies and to actively participate in the Warsaw Pact's activity until it is disbanded simultaneously with NATO. We believe that in all circumstances it is necessary to collaborate with the socialist countries' armies and other friendly armies in the cause of defending our countries and their independence against any outside aggression.

Dwelling on questions of enhancing the party's leading role and implementing socialist building, the speaker noted that the RCP now has 3,831,000 members, which is over 431,000 more than before the previous congress. During the period between congresses, the party was joined by 590,000 working people. Some 390,000 of them are workers.

It must be constantly borne in mind that our party has pledged to the people to ensure the building of the new social system. The party cannot abandon its revolutionary responsibility; it cannot surrender its historic mission to some other political force.

Speaking of the party's ideological activity, the speaker emphasized the special role played by ideological, theoretical, and educational work in shaping the new man.

Dwelling on questions of the international situation and the foreign policy of the RCP and the Romanian state, the speaker noted that two diametrically opposed trends continue to exist in the world arena. On the one hand, there is an intensification of the imperialist neocolonialist policy, the policy of domination and oppression, of violation of the peoples' independence and sovereignty, of plunder and enrichment at other states' expense, of gross and impermissible interference in other peoples' internal affairs. Life convincingly shows that, in international events, financial and bank capital and supranational monopolies have become the main forms for exploiting other peoples, primarily the developing countries.

At the same time, progressive democratic forces which oppose imperialist policy, the policy of war, and that advocate disarmament, peace, and free and independent development for all nations in the world are becoming established with particular force.

The present serious socioeconomic situation in the world is also being aggravated as a result of the continuing arms race, the production and improvement of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction, and the growth of military expenditure.

Romania resolutely advocates the development of relations with all countries regardless of their social system. We have always acted for the implementation of disarmament and the solution of disputed questions between states by means of talks and have supported the struggle for national liberation and the peoples' struggle for independence and sovereignty.

The Socialist Republic of Romania, N. Ceausescu said, now maintains diplomatic, economic, and other relations with 155 states and is resolutely striving to develop broad economic, scientific, technical, and cultural cooperation. We base relations with all states on the principles of complete equality, respect for national independence and sovereignty, noninterference in internal affairs and mutual advantage, and every people's right to choose their path of development freely and without any outside interference.

We have always paid and will continue to pay special attention to the expansion of relations with all socialist countries and the strengthening of their unity and solidarity both in socialist building and in the struggle to solve serious international problems.

Proceeding from the serious international situation and the existence of huge stockpiles of nuclear and chemical weapons and other means of mass destruction, we believe that the fundamental question of our time is to implement disarmament, and primarily nuclear disarmament, and to completely eliminate all nuclear arms by the year 2000, as proposed by the Soviet Union.

True, certain steps have been taken toward disarmament as a result of the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles in Europe, and talks on the reduction of conventional arms are now being held. But nuclear tests are continuing, new nuclear weapons are being produced, and existing ones are being improved. There is the widely known decision by NATO countries to modernize shorter-range systems and tactical weapons, which will result in a severalfold increase of their destructive power.

Great importance attaches to the talks between the Soviet Union and the United States on a 50-percent reduction in strategic nuclear arms. It is, however, necessary to proceed from the need to reach agreement on ending the testing and production of new types of nuclear weapons and to set the earliest possible deadline for their complete elimination. Romania advocates the conclusion of a universal agreement on the final cessation of all nuclear tests and the cessation of nuclear weapons production by all states. We believe that it is necessary to abandon—this applies to both NATO and Warsaw Pact countries—any modernization of nuclear weapons until the year 2000. Within this framework, Romania proposes the conclusion of a universal agreement with the participation of all European states on eliminating all nuclear weapons in Europe by 1995.

We will continue to support any initiatives aimed at the peaceful settlement of conflicts in various parts of the

world. In this context, I would like to reaffirm Romania's resolve to pursue with all its energy a political settlement in the Near East and the holding of an international conference under UN auspices with the participation of all interested sides and the Security Council's permanent members.

We firmly support Afghanistan's people in their struggle for independence and the solution of problems via reconciliation, without any outside interference.

One particularly serious problem of international life is the widening gap between rich and poor countries and the steady deterioration of the developing countries' position. It is necessary to pursue a new economic policy based on equality and mutual advantage and to eliminate as swiftly as possible the problem of underdevelopment by supporting the developing countries. This demands a solution to the problem of the developing countries' external debt.

We firmly advocate the convening of an international conference on these questions.

At the same time, we advocate even further enhancement of the role of the United Nations and other international organizations in solving complex problems in the interests of every nation's independence, of peace and international cooperation.

Dwelling on the RCP's ties with the international workers movement and the workers and progressive parties, N. Ceausescu pointed out that the RCP is actively developing cooperation and solidarity with communist and workers parties and all progressive forces. We have resolutely advocated and continue to advocate a new unity precluding interference in internal affairs and based on invariable respect for every party's independence and its right to elaborate its own political line in conformity with its own country's realities.

Taking into account the complex situation in the communist and workers movement, the RCP advocates the organization of meetings in various forms, including the holding of regional and international conferences for the purpose of jointly discussing questions perturbing the entire communist and workers movement, and a quest for the best possible forms of collaboration and solidarity.

The congress participants, N. Ceausescu declared in conclusion, must analyze with a sense of lofty responsibility the course of the building of socialism in Romania and must adopt the most correct decisions regarding our motherland's steady advance toward new heights of progress and civilization. The congress decisions must he aimed at the country's development and the consolidation of the motherland and of its independence and sovereignty.

The congress continues.

Ceausescu Statement Not 'Claim' on Moldavia

LD2311192189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1742 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 23 Nov (TASS)—TASS Political Observer Yuriy Kornilov writes:

The Romanian Communist Party's [RCP] [words indistinct] Congress is continuing its work in Bucharest. Making the report at that congress, N. Ceausescu, RCP general secretary and president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, recalled that 50 years have now passed since the beginning of World War II, and indicated in this connection that it is impossible to forget the lessons of history. It is well known that mankind, primarily the peoples of the Soviet Union, and also our people, suffered tens of millions of human casualties and immense destruction, he added. Romania considers it necessary to adopt a clear, unambiguous position of condemnation and annulment of all agreements concluded with Hitler's Germany, and to draw practical conclusions for eliminating all the consequences of those agreements and dictates, N. Ceausescu stated.

These remarks by the Romanian leader have attracted the attention of the Western mass information media. Some of the latter, including the Vienna correspondent of AGENCE FRENCE PRESSE and "Radio Liberty," which has become established in Munich, when reporting on the RCP Congress, interpret the statement by N. Ceausescu as some kind of "claim" to the territory or part of the territory of Soviet Moldavia.

Naturally, Western propaganda centers are free to interpret some or other events or statements by political leaders in any manner which suits them. It is appropriate, however, to recall that peace in Europe is assured—and this is particularly stressed in the Helsinki Final Act—thanks precisely to the inviolability of the postwar European borders. No responsible or serious politician can call into doubt—and as far as I know, is calling into doubt—those borders, including the USSR border with Romania.

Central Committee Greets Romanian Congress

LD1911171789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] The 14th Romanian Communist Party Congress begins its work tomorrow.

The CPSU Central Committee sent greetings to its participants. The message said that the CPSU values its relations with Romanian Communists, which are developing on the basis of the principles of noninterference, equality of rights, and a mutual interest in each other's successes. The comparison of views and opinions and the exchange of working experience help to interpret ways of revealing the humanist potential of socialism, on which the progress of each of the socialist countries and the attractiveness of the socialist idea in the world depend Being convinced that cooperation between the

CPSU and the Romanian Communist Party serve the interests of the two countries' peoples and the cause of the struggle for peace and socialism, we affirm our readiness to deepen and enrich it.

A CPSU delegation led by Comrade Vorotnikov will take part in the congress' work.

Bulgaria Eliminating Trappings of Zhivkov 'Cult'

PM2311184189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 89 First Edition p 7

[Own correspondent L. Zhmyrev dispatch: "In Context of Change"]

[Text] Sofia, 23 Nov—Social life in Bulgaria is currently proceeding in the context of the change ushered in by the 10 November Bulgarian Communist Party [BCP] Central Committee Plenum. At rallies attended by thousands of people, meetings, and in newspapers Communists and nonparty people are making an -de th analysis of the past and drawing lessons for the fu . Young people—particularly students, the scientif. artistic, and technical intelligentsia, and the vanguard of working people in the cities and villages—have become more active.

The press has reported P. Mladenov's meeting with the heads of diplomatic missions. The Bulgarian leader stated that Bulgaria's foreign policy will be peaceful—a policy of developing friendship and cooperation with the socialist countries, a policy of cooperating with all the Balkan states and peoples, and a policy of mutual understanding based on mutual advantage and Bulgaria's openness to the world.

The decisions of the BCP Central Committee Politburo meeting held Wednesday have produced an extensive reaction. The meeting examined the progress of preparations for the next BCP Central Committee plenum, to be held 11 December. It is planned to launch a wide-ranging discussion on the questions of perestroyka in the BCP and in the sphere of economics and management. These issues will be discussed at the plenum.

A party-state commission has been set up to examine and resolve the urgent issues linked with the deformations committed in social and economic life. A. Lukanov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the BCP Central Committee, was appointed chairman of the commission.

With a view to eliminating the accretions of the cult of T. Zhivkov and his family, the Politburo has released his son, Vladimir Zhivkov, from his job as chief of the BCP Central Committee Culture Department. It was also decided to close the "Znamya Mira" Center named for Lyudmila Zhivkova, the daughter of the former Bulgarian leader. The funds allocated for the center's work will henceforth be channeled into the "Detstvo" social fund to benefit orphans and mother-and-child care centers.

The Politburo also discussed the question of the representative residences and hunting grounds set up over the past few years, most of which were only "rarely and partially" used. They will now be handed over to labor collectives as treatment and vacation centers for children, and be re-equipped as medical centers, sanitariums, and health and tourist complexes.

West Europe

Gorbachev, Mitterrand To Hold Talks 6 Dec

LD2211181889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1805 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Nov (TASS)—It was announced here today that Mikhail Gorbachev and Francois Mitterrand have agreed to hold a short working meeting in Kiev on 6 December in order to exchange views on the development of the international and European situation.

Minister Yazov Concludes Visit to Austria

Received by Chancellor Vranitsky

LD2211002189 Moscow TASS in English 2024 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Vienna November 21 TASS—Federal Chancellor Franz Vranitsky of Austria met Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov here today. Yazov is currently in Austria on an official visit.

Soviet-Austrian relations, imbued with mutual respect, are characterised by stability and dynamism, the sides emphasised.

The consistent development of all-round Soviet-Austrian cooperation, which meets the interests of the peoples of the two countries, peace and security in Europe, is based on a solid foundation of the full observance of the 1955 State Treaty on the Restoration of Independence and Democratic Austria and a law on the permanent neutrality of Austria.

The meeting was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Visits Austrian Army Regiment

LD2211002489 Moscow TASS in English 2139 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Vienna November 21 TASS—Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov today visited the 35th Mobilisation Training Regiment of the Austrian Army. He had a frank and interesting talk with officers and soldiers of this military unit. Yazov is currently in Austria on an official visit.

He had a moving meeting in the Soviet Embassy in Vienna with a group of Austrian military rescuers who had taken part in clean-up operations following the earthquake in Armenia.

Yazov presented the order "For Personal Courage", a state award of the Soviet Union, to them for resolute actions and selflessness in extreme conditions. He voiced heartfelt gratitude to Austrian citizens, institutions and organisations that had showed solidarity with the Armenian people and had given an effective support and selfless assistance to them.

In the evening Yazov gave a reception in the Soviet Embassy in Austria in honour of Robert Lichal, Austrian federal minister of national defence.

More on Activities, Remarks

PM2211150789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "USSR Defense Minister's Visit to Austria Continues"]

[Text] Vienna, 21 Nov—Soviet-Austrian relations, pervaded with mutual respect, are characterized by their stability and dynamism. The consistent development of all-around cooperation between the Soviet Union and Austria, which accords with the interests of the peoples of both countries and peace and security in Europe, is based on the firm foundation of the full observance of the 1955 State Treaty on the restoration of an independent and democratic Austria and the law on the Alpine republic's permanent neutrality. This was stressed during the talk held here between Austrian Federal Chancellor F. Vranitzky and Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, who is in Austria on an official visit.

The meeting, in which G.S. Shikin, USSR ambassador to Austria, took part, took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

On the same day Army General D.T. Yazov visited the 35th mobilization training regiment of the Austrian Army. The USSR defense minister had frank, involved talks with officers and soldiers of that military unit.

Army General D.T. Yazov had a moving meeting at the USSR Embassy in Vienna with a group of Austrian military rescue workers who took part in the work to eliminate the consequences of the earthquake in Armenia. The USSR defense minister presented them with state awards of the Soviet Union—"For Personal Courage" orders which they have been awarded for their resolute actions and selflessness under extreme conditions. He expressed cordial thanks to the citizens, institutions, and organizations of the Alpine republic who displayed solidarity with the people of Armenia and rendered them effective support and selfless aid.

In the evening the USSR defense minister held a reception in the USSR Embassy in Moscow in honor of R. Lichal, Austrian federal minister of national defense.

Meets Waldheim, Commemorates Soldiers

LD2211211289 Moscow TASS in English 1930 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Vienna November 22 TASS—General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov, alternate member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and USSR Defense minister, now on an official visit in Austria, was received by Austria's Federal President Kurt Waldheim today.

During the ensuing conversation, they noted a good-neighbourly character of relations between the two countries and their constructive role in the development of the European process.

The Soviet defense minister places wreaths at the monument to fallen fighters for the freedom of the Alpine republic, and at the monument of Soviet soldiers who gave their lives for Austria's liberation.

On the same day, General of the Army Yazov visited the Theresia Milita[illegible] Academy at Wiener Neustadt, the only educational esta[illegible]shment training junior officers for the Austrian Army.

Meets Warsaw Pact Talks Delegations

LD2211210689 Moscow TASS in English 1928 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Vienna November 22 TASS—General of the Army Dmitriy Yazov, alternate member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and USSR defence minister, on an official visit here, met today with members of the delegations of the Warsaw Treaty countries at the talks on conventional armed forces in Europe and at the talks on confidence- and security-building measures.

The ways of speeding up these forums and achieving tangible results were discussed.

On Role of Red Army

AU2311171389 Vienna WIENER ZEITUNG in German 23 Nov 89 p 4

["H.E." report: "Awards for Armenia Relief Corps"]

[Excerpts] The Soviet Defense Minister Dimitriy Yazov, who is currently on a visit to Vienna, presented awards to five officers of the Armenia Relief Corps at the Soviet Embassy yesterday [22 November]. [Passage omitted]

After the ceremony, the Soviet defense minister stressed in reply to questions by journalists that the Red Army is a "stabilizing element" in Europe, and that therefore a complete withdrawal is out of the question. "Armies do not arrive just like that. They were called after the Potsdam Conference." A gradual reduction of the Armed Forces both in the USSR and Eastern Europe has long begun, he pointed out. "We have taken unilateral disarmament steps. Further progress depends on the CSCE talks."

Yazov described the growing unrest among the 4-million-strong Army because of the reduction of personnel as a result of insufficient social security as "not substantial." He also clearly welcomed the reduction of troop strengths, thus indirectly confirming that this has become necessary because of a lack of financial resources.

He does "not know" about attacks against his person because of the brutal excesses by the army against the demonstrators in the Georgian capital "Tbilisi." The committee investigating the incidents has repeatedly leveled this accusation. Since during the suppression of the nationalist demonstration shots were fired indiscriminately into the crowd and tanks were used, which has meanwhile been recognized as harmful to the Army's reputation, no one wants to assume responsibility now. "The documents of the committee will be discussed in the next few days," Yazov stated.

Says Army Stabilizing Factor in Europe

AU2311165589 Vienna DER STANDARD in German 23 Nov 89 p 3

[Interview with USSR Defense Minister Dimitriy Yazov by Livia Klingl and Josef Kirchengast in Vienna: "The Soviet Army Was and Still Is a Stabilizing Factor in Europe"; date not given]

[Text] DER STANDARD: How do you see the role of the Soviet Army at this time of change in Eastern Europe?

Yazov: We believe that the Soviet Army was and still is a stabilizing factor in Europe. The Army was deployed in Eastern Europe after the war. It has been doing and is still doing everything possible to safeguard peace.

DER STANDARD: Do you consider a withdrawal of the Soviets from the GDR possible if the United States were to withdraw from the FRG?

Yazov: I think that an agreement will be concluded on this issue. Neither army came to Europe just like that—they were deployed in accordance with the agreement of the Potsdam Conference. Talks are under way now which do not aim at withdrawing all troops but a considerable number of troops. We are unilaterally reducing our Armed Forces in Europe. Negotiations on this issue are being held in Vienna. We hope they will conclude successfully.

DER STANDARD: Does the reduction of the strength of troops in the Soviet Union announced by President Mikhail Gorbachev, which has partly been carried out, meet with unanimous approval within the Army?

Yazov: Yes, there is no doubt about it.

DER STANDARD: However, a trade union has been set up to try and protect the rights of those who have been demobilized.

Yazov: If 90 men of the Soviet Army, which comprises 4 million members, gather, they will not decide about the whole Army. There must and will not be a trade union within the Army. It is not active servicemen that are involved but pensioners and soldiers who have been demobilized.

DER STANDARD: You have come in for criticism in connection with the use of troops in Tbilisi on 9 April this year, where people were killed during demonstrations. The committee investigating the incidents discovered violations of Soviet laws.

Yazov: I have not heard that I have been criticized.

DER STANDARD: Is it correct that you personally ordered the troops to intervene?

Yazov: People talk a lot. This committee has received certain documents. They will be presented to the next session of the Congress of People's Deputies, and then we will see.

Ends Visit, Departs for Home

LD2311221389 Moscow TASS in English 2026 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Vienna November 23 TASS—Visiting Soviet Defence Minister General Dmitriy Yazov met today with military officials of the Tyrol Land.

At the afternoon Yazov and his Austrian counterpart Robert Lichal held a joint news conference in Vienna.

In the evening Yazov left for Moscow. Lichal and other Austrian officials were in the seeing-off party at the airport.

FRG's Johannes Rau Arrives in Moscow

Met by Vlasov

LD2211145189 Hamburg DPA in German 1237 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—The prime minister of North Rhine-Westphalia, Johannes Rau, arrived in Moscow today for a 3-day visit. He was welcomed at Moscow's airport by the government leader of the Russian constituent republic, Aleksandr Vlasov. Rau, who will also meet state and party leader Mikhail Gorbachev, hopes to discuss both inter-German relations and an intensification of economic cooperation with the Soviet Union.

Rau's visit is occasioned by the opening of the "North Rhine-Westphalia Days of Information," an economic exhibition. During his stay, the prime minister will also sign a memorandum on close cooperation in environmental protection, negotiated by Environment Minister Klaus Matthiesen and the Soviet State Planning Committee, Gosplan.

Discusses Trade Ties With Katushev

LD2311155689 Hamburg DPA in German 1354 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Moscow (DPA)—In view of the drastic worsening of supplies in the USSR, Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Konstantin Katushev has addressed an appeal for aid to the Federal Republic. In a talk with the minister president of North Rhine-Westphalia, Johannes Rau (SPD) [Social Democratic party] today, Katushev addressed a "sincere request" to the FRG to give "active advice and suggestions" in order to improve the worsening situation in the USSR. This second day of Rau's 3-day visit to Moscow was dominated by possibilities for expanding econom ic relations with the Soviet Union.

Apart from supplying the population with daily necessities, there are bottlenecks in hard currency and unexpectedly great difficulties in the implementation of economic reform. Katushev openly admitted. It is essential to achieve improvements by 1990-91. The policy of perestroyka is now understood everywhere. Its ideas now have to be put into practice, the Soviet minister added. First this means hard times for Soviet citizens. [passage omitted]

Katushev did not underestimate the difficulties facing German firms in finding the right group to approach after the economic reform in the USSR. Communications problems exist between the large enterprises already having separate accounting, and the central administration, which still had to approve projects and especially hard currency for foreign purchases. Katushev described this as a "vicious circle" in which the Western enterprises were caught up. Rau underlined that the construction of the USSR economy and industry center in Duesseldorf would be very helpful in solving these difficulties in the future.

This morning, Rau opened the North Rhine-Westphalian economic days with the government chief of the Russian federation, Aleksandr Vlasnov. It was attended by over 400 economic representatives from the East and West. [passage omitted]

Abalkin Heads Economic Delegation to Brussels

LD2011233189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2245 GMT 20 Nov 89

[Text] Brussels, 21 Nov (TASS)—A group of leading Soviet economic scientists, headed by Academician Leonid Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, arrived in Brussels on Monday at the invitation of the Commission of European Communities [CEC]. They will take part in a seminar held by the CEC on the subject "Economic Reform in the USSR and Prospects for Cooperation with the European Communities."

The program for the visit also includes meetings between Leonid Abalkin and J. Delors, president of the CEC; F. Andriessen, member of the CEC responsible for external relations; and W. Claes, vice prime minister of Belgium, minister of economic affairs and planning.

Meets With EC's Delors

LD2211001489 Moscow TASS in English 2135 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Strasbourg November 21 TASS—Jacques Delor, president of the Commission of the European Communities (CEC), today received Leonid Abalkin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Abalkin is leading a group of Soviet economists who are taking part in the CEC seminar dealing with the economic reform in the Soviet Union.

The course of the economic reform in the Soviet Union and the problems of West European integration were discussed during the meeting. Prospects for the development of relations between the Soviet Union and the European Communities were also considered.

Talks to Press After Seminar

LD2311115489 Moscow TASS in English 1141 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Brussels November 23 TASS—By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov:

A seminar on Soviet economic reforms that has ended here was a serious, frank and useful dialogue, its participants said.

The seminar held by the Commission of the European Communities was attended by a group of Soviet economists led by Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin, scientists from France, Italy, Belgium, the United States, as well as a number of highplaced European Community officials.

The processes currently under way in the Soviet Union and other socialist countries are of historical significance, Antonio Maria Costa, head of the Commission's Economic and Financial Directorate-General and one of the seminar organisers, said, summing up its results.

West European countries are interested in East European reforms. Their successful outcome is crucial for the future of the common European home, he said.

Numerous journalists in Brussels attended a news conference held by Abalkin. He did not conceal the serious Soviet economic difficulties and dwelt on measures being taken by the government to overcome them. The USSR should solve the main problems itself, he stressed.

When asked about strings attached in giving Western aid to socialist countries, he said: "The Soviet Union owes nothing to anybody. We shall have enough forces and resources to implement what has been planned. If obstacles are raised in our way, more time will be required. If there is cooperation with us, we shall do what we plan faster and more successfully".

The relations between the two parts of the continent should be based on the principles of mutual respect,

equality for rights and recognition of every country's right to a historical choice, Abalkin stressed.

There are vast possibilities for this development. Both sides could benefit from the conclusion of an agreement on trade and economic cooperation between the USSR and the European Community.

The Soviet economic reform has been thoroughly and critically discussed at the seminar, he said. The Soviet participants learnt about Western specialists' views on problems facing the USSR. "We have become convinced that there is a general interest in the success of perestroyka which is of great significance not only to the USSR but also to the whole of Europe," he said.

During the seminar Abalkin met European Commission President Jacques Delors, Belgian Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Economic Affairs and Planning Willy Claes and Belgian Minister of Foreign Trade Robert Urbain. Prospects of USSR-European Community relations and Soviet-Belgian ties were discussed.

Shevardnadze Receives French Ambassador 23 Nov

LD2311103789 Moscow TASS in English 1011 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze received Jean-Marie Merillon, France's ambassador in the USSR, today.

Preparations for the forthcoming Soviet-French working meeting at a summit level were discussed.

Latin America & Caribbean

Official Denies Arms Sent to El Salvador Rebels

PA2411052289 Panama City ACAN in Spanish 0200 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] San Jose, 23 Nov (ACAN-EFE)—Karen Jashaturov, chairman of the Soviet Committee of Solidarity with Latin America [name and title as received], today stated in Costa Rica that his country has not sent military aid to the Salvadoran guerrillas, because the Soviet Union supports a political solution to the armed conflict in El Salvador.

Jashaturov is heading the Soviet delegation that began a Latin American tour today in Costa Rica "to gain a knowledge of what is happening in the region and to listen to what the presidents may have to say."

The diplomat said that the Soviet Union "is in favor of a dialogue, of a political arrangement that will put an end to the Salvadoran conflict and to all the conflicts in the area."

This afternoon the Soviet mission met with Costa Rican President Oscar Arias, whose opinions were characterized as "very valuable" by Jashaturov. The Soviet visitor believes that the president will continue making "his important contribution to the cause of peace."

Regarding the military offensive launched by the Salvadoran guerrillas on 11 November, Jashaturov said that "it is within the logic of a civil war." He noted: "We say that what is happening in Central America is the result of tensions that did not begin yesterday, that it is the result of a process that has occurred slowly. We hope that President Arias and Costa Rica, with their example as a peaceful country, will serve to promote the road to peace."

Jashaturov talked with the media at the conclusion of his meeting with Arias at Arias' home. He justified the lifting of the cease-fire in Nicaragua saying that "it is the result of Contra activities." He said that President Daniel Ortega "is trying to find a common language with the anti-Sandinists, who seem to be forgetting that by 5 December they must be disarmed."

The Soviet delegation will go to Guatemala this weekend and from there it will visit first Honduras and then Nicaragua.

Supreme Soviet Session

21 Nov Supreme Soviet Addresses

Primakov Speech

LD2211134989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1606 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Speech by Deputy Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov; from the recorded relay of the 21 November morning session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Excerpts] Esteemed comrade deputies. The significance of the standing orders submitted for your consideration is that they determine the manner and forms of work for the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet and their bodies. And this will, to a great extent, influence the activity of the country's highest legislative bodies in conditions of restructuring all aspects of the life of our society. Hence, also, the heightened attention to the draft under consideration.

The initial version of the draft standing orders was distributed to all USSR People's Deputies in August this year. The committees on issues of legislation, and on issues of the work of the soviets of people's deputies, took an especially active part in further elaborating the draft. The USSR Supreme Soviet committees on issues of ecology and on international affairs sent their comments. A large role in shaping some of the most important clauses of the draft was played by USSR People's Deputies Sebentsov, Lubenchenko, Levykin, Andreyeva, Dudko, and Stankevich. More than 140 comments and proposals on practically all articles of standing orders were received from deputies. All proposals and comments have been considered, and an overwhelming portion of them was taken into account. Significant assistance was provided by scholars and jurists of the institutes of Soviet State Organization and Legislation and of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Kuznetsov, Polenina, Pigelkin Studenikina, and Kryzhkov. All of this is yet another indication, comrades, that the legislative process in our country has already gone beyond its traditional scope, when the drafts of legislative acts were as a rule prepared outside the Supreme Soviet, and were sent to the Supreme Soviet for voting.

The standing orders are based on the tenets of the existing Constitution. At the same time, some consitutional tenets were further developed and firmed up, of which I shall speak later.

But one cannot limit onself to ascertaining this. The standing orders already reflect the practice of the functioning both of the first Congress of USSR People's Deputies and of the Supreme Soviet and its committees and commissions, and of the People's Deputies of the USSR. In other words, this is already the legislative consolidation of the affirmative and positive which is manifest among us in practice. This is an important part of the legal basis of the political reform under way in the country. For this reason, democratic principles, and glasnost, without which true peoples power is impossible, have a particular significance in the draft standing orders.

Allow me not to give a detailed description of separate sections and norms of the draft law. I hope that over the past few months, you have familiarized yourselves with the idea of the draft law and its main tenets, and have tested them to a significant extent in the practice of your own work, and finally, have perceived the whole complexity of the procedure of considering the matter in the USSR Supreme Soviet and in its committees and commissions, and, from this point of view have appraised the plusses and minuses of the draft presented.

It must be said that the standing orders will have to be improved in the process of all subsequent work. But at present, the time is coming when it is necessary to determine the attitude of the Supreme Soviet to the draft law and the stance on which it would be possible to go to the Congress.

In general, the standing orders of the parliaments of all countries have been improved over the years and decades, and some standing orders have been improved over hundreds of years. It is a constant process of improvement and there can be no dogmatism at all here. If we adopt this document now, it is perfectly clear that we will in the future work on its improvement. This is a natural requirement of life.

As I have already said, all the proposals and comments on the draft law received were carefully considered. The greater part of the proposals testify to support for the idea, and the majority of the norms of the draft law. At the same time, people's deputies are proposing to include specific elaborations, supplements, and amendments in its text.

To begin with, concerning those comments which have already been taken into account in the text. This concerns, first and foremost, proposals relating to improving the legislative process. Thus, a number of deputies, comrades Alekseyev, Lubenchenko, and Gryazin consider that draft laws should without fail pass through a consideration stage in the committees and commissions before they are presented for the consideration of the USSR Supreme Soviet. this proposal will require the inclusion of an amendment in the USSR Constitution, but it has already been implemented in the draft standing orders.

The draft is based on the idea of the decisive role of committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the standing commissions of its chambers in the preparation and preliminary examination of draft laws which have been prepared and submitted. It is precisely those bodies which must discuss various versions of legislative decisions and put forward conclusions on the adoption of amendments to them; and the more effective and active the work in the committees and commissions is, the more rapid and high-quality the progress of work at the

Congress of People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet will be. We have already become fully convinced of this.

The proposals by people's deputies on the procedure for examining amendments to a draft law have been implemented. The draft regulations stipulate two readings for a draft law. In the process of the first reading the basic tenets of the draft law must be examined and approved, and proposals and comments for improving it must be expressed. In other words, the basis of the draft law's concept must be laid down and the attitude to alternative drafts must also be expressed, if any are submitted.

In the process of the second reading the further-elaborated draft must be examined article by article, as a rule. In this connection, the proposals by USSR People's Deputies comrades Sobchak, Krayko, and Ryabchenko have been implemented with regard to the specific features of the procedure for the second reading of a draft law, and for passing all proposals on it to the committees and commissions. Comrades Timashova, Gryazin, and others. [incomplete sentence as heard]

Proposals have been taken into account with regard to the procedure for voting at the Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet, using an electronic vote-counting system. The proposals by deputies Burbulis, Marchenko, Prudnikov, and others on voting by name have been implemented. Here I would like to say, comrades, that we will clearly have to further improve the work related to the new regulations. For instance, a number of deputies are raising issues which seem to me to have arisen in a very timely manner, about it being necessary for us to precisely define what a second reading is. Some deputies, Deputy Krayko in particular, consider that after a document has already been prepared for the second reading of a draft law in the committees and commissions, it must be obligatory for amendments to be sent there in written form, and if the committees or commissions and the appointed chief committee do not adopt these amendments, they must provide an explanation with the motives for not adopting them; and after that, when the draft law is submitted to us at the Supreme Soviet session for the second reading, the floor is given only to those—and only for a limited period of time—who are explaining the essence of their amendment and asking for a vote on it, and only to those whose amendments have been turned down by the relevant committees and commissions. No second discussion is conducted that has already taken place previously in committees and commissions or at the first reading. Voting takes place, with the floor being given to those comrades whose amendments were not adopted at the commissions and committees. It seems to me that this is an interesting idea, and it should be thought about, because we really have sensed from our own practice that this could very much ease our work, and speed it up without any loss in quality, so to speak. [passage omitted]

According to the established rules, standing orders should be strictly in accordance with the Constitution. But in our turbulent age of restructuring legislation, we shall unfortunately not succeed in observing the established scheme. For this reason, without predetermining the issue, we would be able, if these norms and drafts of standing orders are supported by the People's Deputies, to propose to the Congress to also include the appropriate amendments and supplements in the USSR Constitution. [passage omitted]

The issue of deputies uniting in groups of USSR People's Deputies is a new aspect in the work of the highest state body. A special chapter is devoted to it in the draft standing orders. It envisions that USSR People's Deputies, elected by national territorial and territorial constituencies within the confines of a union republic, and also People's Deputies from public organizations working or residing on the territory of that union republic, comprise a group of USSR People's Deputies of the given union republic. It is also pointed out that apart from these groups, USSR People's Deputies have the right to unite in other standing and ad hoc groups of USSR People's Deputies. [passage omitted]

I would like to draw your attention to the following provision of the regulations: At the Congress of People's Deputies, work is conducted in Russian, reflecting the political reality that the Russian language is today fulfilling the function of a language of interethnic intercourse.

At the same time, the draft regulations specifically state that if a USSR people's deputy does not have a command of Russian, he has the right to speak in another language of the peoples of the USSR. When he does so, a translation into Russian is provided. Of course, a people's deputy must notify the Congress Secretariat in advance of his intention to speak in another language. [passage omitted]

Comrade deputies, you of course understand that in such a complicated and voluminous document, which affects many sometimes conflicting interests, it is impossible to take into account all proposals and remarks. Allow me to dwell on a few of those proposals and remarks which have not been taken into account.

Several people's deputies submitted a proposal to the effect that questions —all questions—in the USSR Supreme Soviet should be resolved on the basis of consensus of the 15 republics. This proposal was discussed thoroughly and in several variants, and seems, in principle, unacceptable. Even though it is not ruled out that in some of its details it can be subsequently realized for some major issues, such as, for instance, speaking hypothetically: Say, the issue being resolved, the question on the agenda is abandoning the federal system. Of course, if one of the union republics objects to this matter, such a proposal should not be adopted on any account.

Not a single federation in the world has a rule regarding the adoption of laws on the basis of the agreement of all its subjects. This is rather a principle of a confederative state.

A number of proposals are connected with trying not to restrict the debate in any way, in particular granting the floor to all deputies insisting on being given the floor. Such proposals also run counter to world parliamentary practice, and their realization may paralyze the functioning of any legislative body, turn parliament into a debating society, something, by the way, the voter is already justly accusing us of.

The proposals of people's deputies regarding detailed regulation of the status of the standing commissions and committees has not been adopted, inasmuch as it is envisaged that these issues will be regulated in special laws.

The proposal was discussed to grant the right of decisive vote in the work of commissions and committees to deputies who are not members of these commissions and committees, and who simply come to their meetings. This proposal was also not included in the draft regulations. It was submitted by People's Deputy Bogomolov.

Several deputies proposed to write into the draft the question of recalling the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I emphasize that it is included on the agenda of the Congress, if one-fifth of people's deputies insists on this. If you recall, in the first version of the draft and in the present variant, the provision to the effect that these issues may be decided by a majority, no less than half of the USSR people's deputies, has been retained. In our view there is no need to make an exception to the general rule on this matter. That general rule says that the agenda of the Congress is drawn up by the Congress on the basis of no less than half of the USSR people's deputies speaking out in favor of including some question or other in it. It is proposed not to single out this issue separately.

Comrades, the draft regulations contain a provision to the effect that the structure and staff of the USSR Supeme Soviet Secretariat is approved by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, whereas the provision regarding the Secretariat is approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet. S ral deputies have submitted proposals that the structure and staff of the USSR Supreme Soviet Secretariat be approved by the Supreme Soviet itself and even by the Congress of People's Deputies. But, if this is done, comrades, we will have even less work, [corrects himself], we will have even less time to engage in lawmaking activity. That is the first point. Second, the Secretariat is not such a body, it seems to me, as to raise it to the high importance of, say, the government or the People's Control Committee or the Committee for Constitutional Supervision, that it should be approved by the Congress or approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet. Apart from that the Presidium is invested with certain powers and, on the whole, it can resolve this problem in a very skilled way.

Konev Speech

LD2211111489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1720 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Speech by Deputy Sergey Ivanovich Konev; from the recorded relay of the 21 November morning session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted supporting the view of Deputy Nazarenko and stressing important aspects of the draft law under discussion]

I think it is necessary to hear first of all the conclusion of the Congress commission on the events in Tbilisi and the Gdlyan affair. The fact of the matter is that, depending on the conclusions of that commission, the Congress possibly may have to adopt a special decision, which requires some time.

The impression is now being created that deliberate attempts are being made to hide these questions until the end of the Congress in order to ensure that, the decisions which the apparatus needs are adopted in an atmosphere of haste and emotional outbursts, as the First Congress of People's Deputies demonstrated, and so that before the very end the commission will be heard in haste in order to downplay its impact and to leave the matter unresolved.

I will be glad if my apprehensions turn out to have been unfounded. Nonetheless, to avoid the development of such a scenario, I consider it necessary to propose the immediate hearing of the results of the commission, taking into account the fact that evaluations have to be made and measures have to be taken regarding people placing obstacles in the way of a full investigation. Once again, I ask the chairman not to forget to put my question to the vote, should that be possible. Thank for your attention.

Stankevich Speech

LD2211120789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1732 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Speech by Deputy Sergey Borisovich Stankevich; from the recorded relay of the 21 November morning session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted on importance of procedural regulations and ways for improving them] About the section on groups, in principle it is a very good thing that we have included that section in our Parliament. I want to draw your attention to how quickly our parliamentary culture is developing and being streamlined. Even 6 months ago, the very posing of the question of the presence of groups in Parliament caused shock and a storm of emotions. Now it is the norm and does not surprise anyone; it is regarded as something quite natural. That process of the growth of parliamentary culture

can only be welcomed. At the same time, in the section on groups it is nevertheless obviously essential to thoroughly work out the rules of the work of these groups and of their rights. At present, they are mainly of a declarative nature. It seems to me that the rights of groups can be strengthened. And I cannot agree with the thesis that it is not worth limiting the groups quantatively. Once again, in the overwhelming majority of parliaments, quantative measures are introduced on the composition of the groups. In some cases, figures are mentioned outright, and in other cases percentages of the overall number of people's deputies. It seems to me that it makes sense to preserve that.

As for the idea of the resignation of some kinds of large groups of people's deputies according to the results of a referendum, that idea does not seem fruitful to me. I am sorry; I venture not to agree with the previous speaker on this. It seems to me that in that case, responsibility to the electorate should be individual, there should be a recall mechanism, and even better one for early elections, because recalling means leaving a place empty and then elections have to be held again. It is better to hold early elections right away; it is much more effective. But nevertheless, that process must be strictly individual.

Sometimes voices are heard saying we need neither radicals nor conservatives. That implies that there is a certain center which knows precisely at which point all are obliged to be, neither one step ahead nor one step back. I venture once again to affirm that we need to an equal extent both conservatives [and radicals]. We need healthy conservatism; we need people who can always say: Stop, let's halt. Let's think once again. Let's go back and look for where we lost contact, where we lost continuity.

[Lukyanov interrupting] And how can one define the center if there is no right or left?

[Stankevich continues] And in just the same way, we need radicals. I venture to affirm that we need radicals who are perhaps running ahead a little bit, who perhaps are leaving events behind a little bit, but who in this way are testing our subsequent steps in an experimental way. I am categorically against excluding either the one or the other from the political process. I consider that policy should be worked out in the dialogue of these forces, in their interaction. [passage omitted on the relationship between deputies and the apparatus and the need to make deputies professional]

Gryazin Speech

LD2211131889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1743 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Speech by Deputy Igor Nikolayevich Gryazin; from the recorded relay of the 21 November morning session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The first sphere of questions where improvements can be made is connected precisely with deputies' groups or, forgive me for using that terrible word, the right which is allotted to the opposition, or to the parliamentary minority. Let us not fear that word. A parliament without an opposition is a bit senseless, and more precisely, it is even a waste of money. What is the point of having 500 deputies if we can receive complete unanimity by much cheaper means and by paying just 10 odd deputies. Isn't that the case. Let the rest work at their jobs. In other words, the question of opposition or of deputies' groups which are arising here—and there may be several of them—have a fundamental significance for achieving the following aim about which we have always spoken. This aim is to offer a true alternative to the proposed projects. Where can alternatives arise from? Via deputies' groups. Moreover, it is natural that small deputies' groups should have more limited rights than deputies of the majority. That is natural and there can be no objections here. Nevertheless, these rights of the minority should be guaranteed. [passage omitted]

Gubenko Speech

LD2311112189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1949 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Speech by USSR Culture Minister Nikolay Nikolayevich Gubenko; from the recorded relay of the 21 November afternoon session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Excerpts] Esteemed chairman, esteemed deputies,

Each one of us during our life has heard sufficient self-confident utopia's and promises and I would not like to multiply them. I can only share my perhaps not entirely competent thoughts about what the Ministry of Culture should do.

In my view, the ministry's main function should be the creation of conditions favorably influencing a creative personality, not to allow or ban, not to stand over an artist but to be able to put oneself in someone else's place and respect him as oneself, to exist for encouraging and broadening the opportunities of a creative person. It will become natural when representatives of the intelligentsia itself, when those who enjoy its trust, begin to take part in the process of working out state cultural policies. If it is possible to turn the Ministry of Culture into an exponent of the will of the intelligentsia, then, together with the deputies and with all public organizations, the ministry should draw up the state's culture policy, influence the public with the prestige of the intellectual leaders of culture, and try to prove to the government and persuade it of the urgency of some or other decisions and look for ways of resolving the tasks, while at the same time being an executive committee implementing this policy. This is the first point.

Secondly, there is no doubt that each republic, region, and town is obliged to implement its cultural policy, their programs for bilateral and foreign ties, but it seems to me that the painlessness of the process of the cultural

autonomization of the republics and regions at the present stage should be ensured by the union center. At the present time, this is being held up by a multitude of norms and procedures. It is also obvious that if we strive for a union of equal peoples, then the ministry should integrate the republic's cultural policies for drawing up state programs for the preservation and development of multiethnic Soviet art and culture as an entity. The hopes that people pin on deepening the sovereignty of the republics should not lead to self-isolation. Apart from enmity and egoism, this will not yield anything. The process of the revival of national dignity does not mean a person, a people, a republic can be like an island. Any national culture is a derivative of universal human culture.

Without driving ethnic interests [natsionalnyye interesy] into a mythologized unity of the Soviet people, the Ministry should be a regulator of mutual exchange and of mutual enrichment of ethnic cultures [natsionalnyye kultury], very prudently, in a very well thought-out way, principally by means of providing incentives for and the financing of the joint production of plays, the exchange of exhibitions library and museum exchange, guest performances, joint research by art critics, sociologists, students of local lore, history and economy, and the drawing up of humanitarian programs for schools, through special funds, subsidies, grants, and not through a sham, depersonalized internationalism, but through a personal, named, if you like, businesslike internationalism, involving interest and friendship of everyone for everyone. Perhaps I am an idealist, but I cannot assume that a real intellectual, be he a peasant, a worker, a writer, or a politician, would not see a brother in a person of another ethnic group.

I repeat: if we intend to live in a common home, if history has seen to it that our people have found themselves neighbors, then the regulation of ethnic cultural relations will require all-union funds and the family budget of the state. [passage omitted]

Leaving aside criticism of the past when culture and art were equated with the position of an orderly whose duties included the provision of cultural services for the population, one can only cautiously rejoice that today, ideology has started to adopt an attitude toward the revival of culture as a condition of the spiritual rebirth of the country, and as one of the foundations affirming the values of the human personality. But every beginning needs continuation and affirmation by everyday deeds.

How can we do things better? One cannot do without the elaboration of the principles of legislation on culture which would guarantee the legal protection of memorials, museum artefacts, books, library stocks, and the fundamental cultural base, including, first and foremost, the cultural figure, the educator. The law should protect culture from the chance of destruction. Twenty-one years ago, a decision of the Central Committee and the Council of Ministers was published on the compilation of a register of the monuments of the USSR. So far not a single volume has come out in Russia. Twenty-one years have passed. It is said that if we are going to undertake the certification of monuments at that rate, we shall need 50 years. Every year, according to unofficial [as heard] data, 1% of monuments are destroyed, and by unofficial data, 5%. This is a tragedy.

It is clear that it is impossible to get culture out of the crisis condition it is in over a short period of time. But it will be altogether impossible to do that, ever, if the artist's position in society is to remain unaltered. Nor will we be able to solve the financial issues, either now or in the future, as long as the law on intellecutal property is not adopted. In my view, the way out is to free the artist in a radical manner of excessive taxation. If we are unable to pay him properly, let us at least refrain from fleecing him. It should become an ordinary, prosaic thing that a collective, a performer, a theater, a museum, an art critic whose work is in demand should have the independent option of joint production, touring, the exchange and publication of his works. Because if we take more here than they take there, then people leave, and there is no longer anyone to teach in the conservatory. There are not enough teachers.

Collectives and performers must be given maximal freedom; they would be able to conclude deals themselves and to deduct taxes for the state in keeping with the taxation practice throughout the world. In a word, international law and practice ought to be applied.

The question arises: Is there not a danger that these collectives will work solely in the West? But every serious artist hopes that his toil is useful to his motherland. [passage omitted] In my view, a state program of making school and college education more biased towards the humanities is needed. In this context, the question of libraries as one of the most fundamental values of the nation, its brain, comes to the fore. Without libraries it is impossible to retain the memories, to pass on cultural traditions, to introduce general knowledge. What is necessary is a state policy that would resurrect a civilized attitude towards libraries. One has in mind not just the creation and upkeep of the material base, but also a considerable increase in the spending, including the spending of hard currency, on purchasing foreign publications, on training cadres in the best local and foreign universities, and on remunerating library staff in a fitting manner. It is necesary to enhance the indpendence of scientific libraries in the way they collect their stock and in the way in which they tackle cadre issues.

The next thing is this: a third of our population is the countryside, the agrarian sector. Ninety million people engage in peasant work. A majority—just over 20 million [figures as heard] of these people—have no opportunities of even watching television. Most regions are capable of receiving the First Program only. What sort of hope can there be in these conditions for universal literacy or culture when people have simply nowhere to go? Except for a bottle of vodka—this convertible currency—he does not see and does not have any other

opportunities for enriching his impressions. This means that a state policy for culture is needed. [passage omitted]

Naturally, it is legitimate for the state to count on the intelligentsia's attitude of selfless and heroic devotion to lofty goals. What was it, if not this attitude, that saved us from the disaster of reversing the flow of northern rivers? But socialism, Lenin used to say, must be built not on enthusiasm, but with the aid of enthusiasm and on the basis of sensible calculations. Circumstances are now becoming such that culture, as it were, forms no part of these sensible calculations of socialist construction. The 1.2 percent of budget spent on culture is, again, tantamount to making claims on this enthusiasm which is becoming exhausted, just as the coffers of the state are becoming exhausted. Where is the money to be found? But first you must ask how much is needed. No one will answer that because no one calculated it and the reason for this is that there has never been any money for culture and it is forever the case. [passage omitted]

All I know, the feeling I personally get, is that we are facing the danger of commercialization of culture and art. [passage omitted] The percentage of subsidies in our country is lower than in any Western European country, socialist ones included. [passage omitted]

There is the following point: it is not just contacts, but close cooperation with the church, members of informal organizations, students, and emigration that will help us rebuild the edifice of spiritual life and save the country from loutishness and lack of culture. [passage omitted]

Boyars' Speech

LD2211112989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2041 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Speech by Deputy Yuriy Rudolfovich Boyars from the recorded relay of the 21 November USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Moscow Kremlin]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Regarding the status of deputy, something very important: Comrades, we have already written this into our republican law, and the more extensive guarantees for the deputy have received very great approval in the commission.

We therefore propose that a deputy may also not be arrested, searched, and subjected to a personal examination. Because we know that, unfortunately, our law enforcement bodies sometimes still resort to provocations and can very easily plant a wad of money in your desk while you are away and then carry out a search, and that is it: you are done for. Such things are done, and it seems to me that the lawyers sitting in the hall are (?perfectly well) aware of how this is done and in what way. [passage omitted]

Proposals on Draft Ownership Law 21 Nov

PM2411112989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

["Proposals on Draft Law on Ownership in the USSR Submitted by a Group of USSR People's Deputies Representing Autonomous Formations"]

[Text] Paragraph II of Clause 2 of Article 23 of the draft law submitted by the Commission for the Preparation of the Draft Law for Nationwide Discussion should include the following:

Autonomous formations have the same rights of ownership as the union republics, enjoying all the powers of a subject of the law of ownership of land and other natural resources within the confines of its territory.

Moscow TV Airs 22 November Supreme Soviet Session

1600 GMT

LD2211174289

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 22 November begins carrying a recording of the Supreme Soviet session on 22 November at the Kremlin in Moscow. The session is chaired by Yevgeniy Primakov.

Primakov asks deputies to register: there are 411 present. He goes on to outline some of the subjects to be discussed, including the proposal to extend the session's work next week. He tells a deputy that they will not be working on Saturday, but on Monday and Tuesday. He hands the floor to Deputy Bunich, a member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, to deliver a report on the draft law on leasing.

At 1604 GMT, Bunich begins his report. He opens up by posing the question about how to achieve a state of affairs in which people want to work and to see their efforts rewarded. He says that at issue is not merely the principle of leasing but changing existing property relations, and goes on the outline some of the basic precepts of leasing and how collectives may be given the opportunity to purchase property initially leased to them in such a way that the property becomes the property of the collective. He reminds deputies that the document being proposed should come into effect quickly. Time is short.

He then speaks about the kind of industrial relations which may exist in a leasing enterprise.

Later, Bunich outlines some of the obstacles to implementing such a scheme, as is proposed, by 1 January 1990. Who is to lease the property and provide the resources. This had been left in broad outline in the proposal, but he suggests perhaps the financial system would be the mechanism to achieve this, and goes on to raise the possibilities of taxation for the purposes of a

budget for leasing. He recommends the Supreme Soviet to adopt the draft law, and notes how much work had gone into elaborating it.

At 1631 GMT, Deputy Yakovlev answers for the government as minister of justice. He notes the substantial further elaboration of the original proposal and makes a number of points, emphasizing the intention to make enterprises independent economic entities, and the proposals regarding the use of financial levers.

Yakovlev comments various innovations in the draft concerning the protection of the rights of individuals. He believes that the Supreme Soviet will have every justification for adopting the draft, but goes on to recommend amendments.

At 1641 GMT, Deputy Alekseyev, chairman of the Committee for Legislation, Legality and Law and Order takes the floor. He speaks strongly in favor of taking the step of leasing which will take the USSR into a true economic revolution. He says that some people have asked whether this law can be adopted before a law on property has been adopted. He believes it can, and goes on to commend the attractive features of the draft law—including ensuring that people are in charge and will be able to keep more of the funds they earn.

At 1650 GMT, Primakov says that six committees have advocated that the draft law be adopted, as did the government. He says that 36 people asked to speak, and he proposes that only those who wish to introduce substantial changes do speak to ensure a businesslike discussion.

1653 GMT

LD2211182289

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1653 GMT on 22 November continues its recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings.

Deputy Anna Andreyevna Shust takes the floor. She says she works in a leasing enterprise and describes how the working atmosphere has changed with her colleagues understanding the need to work conscientiously. She also deals with collective farm workers who have all sorts of financial problems. She deals with the problems of collective farms in general, without recommending that they should be disbanded in the light of the possibilities offered by the new leasing legislation.

At 1700 GMT, the first session ends. There is a 14-minute break.

At 1714 GMT, the recorded relay resumes. The second session is also chaired by Primakov. Deputy Bocharov supports the document on leasing suggesting the delegation of the second section. He says that there is a great deal of opposition to leasing in the country. He suggests that a commission should be created to discuss the amendments that are being made in this session and to expedite the adoption of the law.

At 1718 GMT Deputy Kisin suggests other amendments to the law. He says the law as it stands is constructive, but makes suggestions about the wording of certain clauses.

The law does not deal in sufficient detail with the case of an enterprise that has been leased being returned to the owner and the legal provisions for this. He deals with questions of subsidies for leasers, capital investment questions and credits.

At 1726 GMT, Primakov reads out a list of deputies who are to be members of the above-mentioned commission: Bunich, Alekseyev, Bocharov, Vologzhin, Yakovlev, and Kalmykov. They leave the hall.

At 1728 GMT, Central Asian Deputy from Tajikstan Gulova talks about the wage levels of collective farm workers and says these should rise with leasing. She deals with questions of reducing the bureaucracy connected with the leasing legislation. There are supply and transportation problems that have to be faced and taken into consideration in adopting the new legislation, to ensure that produce does not go to waste, she says. Leasing should galvanize the economy, she concludes.

At 1735 GMT, Deputy Kirilov calls for the law to be passed today. He makes amendment proposals such as: the leaser should not have the right to sell the property he holds on a leasing contract without the owner's consent.

At this point there is a 30-second break in transmission.

Later, Kirilov talks about the duration of leasing contracts, the holding of stock, the issue of excessive profits, the antimonopolistic provisions of the legislation, the dismissal of employees and guarantees for their welfare.

At 1743 GMT, Deputy Vidiker says the law will provide for the full potential of socialist economic relations to be realized. He makes proposals for amendments. He then deals with provisions in the legislation for bankruptcy and for the social welfare of leasers.

At 1747 GMT, Primakov says all proposals should be passed to the relevant commission.

Deputy Denisov says he supports the law in its conception since it reflects his view of socialism, that of enterprise socialism.

At 1751 GMT, Deputy Sobchak talks about the significance of the draft law. It allows economic reform to be carried out from the bottom of the economic system upwards. He hopes the law will be passed today or tomorrow. He comments on amendments made by previous speakers. The main question is to what extent the state will obstruct the creation of a lease-contracting sector in the economy. He criticizes pricing policy with regard to sales by lease-contracting enterprises. Should the leaser be allowed to sublet or sublease contract the property or enterprise he holds on contract? No, he says. It will lead to trouble.

1800 GMT

LD2211190689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT, on 22 November, continues its recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings.

At 1803 GMT, Deputy Grinovkis says that the lease-contracting law is a fundamental part of economic reform. It is important that the draft law should encourage the producer to perform well. As for subleasing, Grinovkis is against it, just as previous speakers. There should only be one main leaser. Grinovkis agrees with the idea of people gaining possession of an item leased out when the payments they have made are equal to the original value of the item concerned.

Deputy Mukhametzyanov says that if the draft law is passed, this will be a major step forward in the economic reform. He suggests some amendments to improve the draft law.

At 1814 GMT, Primakov announces an adjournment.

At 1815 GMT, a video caption announces the afternoon session. Deputy Motornyy says that draft law on leasing is one of the main points of strategy in achieving the food program. The law on lease-contracting must work well. It is not enough to have a strategy which sounds good; the strategy must work in practice too. It is necessary to know the prices involved in lease-contracting, too. How can one have different prices for one and the same thing? Such things should be considered before a draft law is produced, he says. There must be more labor, technological and supply discipline. The lease-contracting system should be brought in for unprofitable farms and farms with low profits rather than for state farms which already are performing well, he opines. Motornyy then calls for construction investments to be switched from fine city buildings to necessary rural construction. As for grain production, one has to hope for good harvests in the next 2 years for all the benefits forseen in the draft law to be realized, he notes. Common sense must prevail with lease-contracting. It must not be introduced as a blanket measure which is obligatory for all, he asserts.

At 1827 GMT, Deputy Aleksandra Balenko says that lease-contracting is to be used on large territories of land rather than on small patches. She talks about the use of territorial lease-contracting in the BAM zone, for example. Local soviets should be pleased to harness the initiative implied in lease-contracting. Lease-contracting, if properly prepared for, will encourage initiative, she believes. It could even revive lost villages in some rural areas. The idea of lease-contracting has found support from youth collectives, Balenko notes. It is important for the term "territorial lease-contracting" to find reflection in the law, she concludes.

At 1834 GMT, Deputy Levashev says that there are some other fine points should be taken into consideration before the law is finally passed. He supports the draft law, because it provides a legal basis for a process which is already underway.

1839 GMT

LD2211202589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1839 GMT on 22 November continues its recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings.

Deputy Prunskene says that the law is in tune with the general direction of economic reform. However, there will be considerable regional differences in the way lease-contracting is implemented and what form it takes in reality. There is a lack of clarity in the law as to who is the lessee in certain sectors of the economy in which lease-contracting will be implemented, he suggests. Further, the state order is a dying institution and this should be taken into consideration in reviewing the law, Prunskene says.

At 1845 GMT, Deputy Kalmykov reviews the rights of lease-contractors to exploit land leased from collective farmers and proposes relevant amendments. He deals in particular with taxation questions as they relate to lease-contractors, and questions of the profitablity of enterprises under the new conditions.

At 1852 GMT, Deputy Pokhodnya proposes amendments to prevent interfernce by the lessee in the running of the enterprises by the lease-contractor. The new law is not the end of the collective farms and state farms, but it may encourage the whole of agriculture to work in new, better ways, in more profitable ways, he says. There is still widespread distrust in the lease-contracting provisions, so people are hesitating to enter into leasing contracts. There is a need for a genuinely independent agriculture, both on the collective farms and on leased farms, he concludes.

At 1857 GMT, Deputy Stepanov asks whether the new law will help the development of a market in agriculture. He discusses the level of taxation that the lease contractors wil have to pay. He says that perhaps the Supreme Soviet is trying to go too fast in passing the laws so quickly.

At 1905 GMT, Deputy Podolyanina says the lack of balance in pricing policy is a central issue in ensuring the success of leasing. Material provision for the new leased enterprises is simply not there in her constituency. There have been cuts. She criticizes certain contradictions in the law regarding state orders. She believes that there is need to protect processing enterprises in her constituency from the full force of the market.

At 1911 GMT, Deputy Zanokha deals with the question of the distribution of subsidies in the agricultural sector.

He is worried that in the production of certain produces the prices are simply not high enough to produce a profit for the lease contractor.

At 1915 GMT, Deputy Lisitskiy says that in his region, the Ukraine, the authorities that could carry out tax collection are not capable of doing this. He suggests other amendments. He deals with questions of responsibilty in the administration of the lease-contracting system. The arrangements seemed biased against the lease-contractor, Lisitskiy suggests.

At 1920 GMT, Deputy Bobritskiy asks whether the law will allow any worker or group of workers to switch over to lease-contracting. He asks: When it is a matter of large enterprises, what is the status of the individual members of such an enterprise, in particular as relates to their rights to a portion of the profits of the enterprise under lease-contracting conditions?

At 1928 GMT, Deputy Khmura expresses the opinion that the law under discussion should be passed together with a law on taxation. The question of taxation is very intimately linked with the success of lease-contracting. He then suggests other amendments concerning payment for natural resources used by leased enterprises.

At 1933 GMT, Primakov says that the question of passing the law on taxation in conjunction with the law on lease-contracting should be considered.

At 1935 GMT, Deputy Engver deals with the conceptual bases of the lease-contracting law. The law should not allow damage to be done to the land or workers to be exploited. He says that the law should come into force from January next year even if it is not perfect by that time. It is true that many laws are interconnected, but nevertheless the country cannot wait for all these laws to be brought into shape.

At 1943 GMT, Deputy Koryugin talks about representation made to him by his constituents on the law. Criticism of the law as it stands is fine, but the law must be passed quickly so that people can start working in new conditions as soon as possible, he asserts.

At 1948 GMT, Primakov calls for a break in proceedings. The afternoon sesion ends.

2005 GMT

LD2211214189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2005 GMT on 22 November continues its recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings. The evening session opens chaired by Primakov. He says that over half of the deputies are present, so proceedings can continue. The draft law on land is to be discussed now. Primakov reads out a letter he has received from Deputy Selezhev proposing that questions about draft laws presented for the first reading should be posed in writing.

At 2008 GMT, Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Nikonov, member of the Committee on Agrarian Issues, delivers a report about the work of committees and commissions on drafting the law on land. He says that many variants were proposed. The drafters visited various research institutes and the document is a blend of all proposals which were made. Attempts were made to form a balance in the draft law on land. Some lands are in a poor state; Nikonov attributes this to the departure from Lenin's principles. Land has become nobody's and People have become alienated from the land, he maintains. The proposed draft law sets out to establish contemporary land relations whereby the peasants are the masters on their own land. The main new point is the attempt to overcome the problem of the land seemingly belonging to no one. He explains that the measures of the draft law envisage land being subordinate to local soviets.

Nikonov goes on to say that there were difference in the positions of the agrarian committee and the committee on legality. However, the principles behind the positions were close. He outlines the cause: The committee on legality wanted to stress the role of lease-givers and lessees, whereas the committee on agrarian issues wanted to use the term land-users.

Nikonov asserts that peasants must be given the right to decide their own destinies; this principle was proclaimed in 1918 but it was violated and must be restored. He believes that it is good to have cooperatives and individual labor involved within one big agricultural enterprise. The question of paying for the land has been raised for the first time, he says, but the point is rent for land and not the purchase of it. The republican authorities will decide how much lessees should pay for the use of the land.

Nikonov explains that the draft law on land also contains provisions concerning forestries. which are not in a good state. Thus, the use of forest lands is also an important issue. Local soviets and bodies subordinate to local soviets must control local land resources, he says. The committee on Ecology prompted many points relating to use of land, and these were incorporated in the draft law on land. These proposals change the previous attitude to land management, he points out. The committees which drafted the law on land ask deputies to pass it. Much thought went into the draft law, however, it is important that these agrarian issues should be debated, he concludes.

At 2028 GMT, Primakov explains that Deputy Sobchak is being allowed to speak a second time because other deputies are not able to be present.

Sobchak says that the idea of making an enterprise the owner of tracts of land entirely changes the situation in law. Ownership implies a right to buy and sell and to pass down. Owners must have a right to dispose of their property as they wish. Therefore the members of the Committee on Legality do not agree with the provision in the draft law which prohibits the buying and selling of

land, he states. It is more important today to define forms of juridically passing the land over to peasants. So local soviets should have a final say on the destiny of land and should be considered the true owners of the land, he suggests.

The above-mentioned approach to ownership of land will enable land to be left in legacies from peasants to their children. this will constitute a more precise ownership for peasants than merely saying that they are owners, he says. Any Soviet person should have the right to work on the land. The ownership of land cannot be given over to executive bodies, as happened in the past, he adds.

As for countrywide discussion of the draft law, the type of countrywide discussion which has become customary—television programs and letters from a few citizens—will hardly advance the cause.

At 2041 GMT, Sobchak proposes a referendum on the issue of land and ownership of land. The issue is too important for private, individual, subjective opinions of some to be allowed to prevail he says. A referendum on this issue would be a good precedent.

At 2043 GMT, Sobchak answers questions which have been presented in writing. He says that each union republic will decide for itself what form of ownership is prevalent there. Asked what guarantees there are that the draft law will actually be fulfilled, sobchak says that liability of officials at all levels should be fixed firmly so that the law on land is implemented.

At 2047 GMT, Primakov says that 27 people have asked to speak and that those who actually speak should only do so if they have conceptual differences; more minor differences can be discussed at committee level.

2049 GMT

LD2211223489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2049 GMT on 22 November continues its recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings.

Deputy Grinovkis says that the multiformity of types of ownership is already recognized in principle. He supports the idea of families having different forms of ownership as well. He is not afraid of the term "private ownership" either. It was all very well for Ryzhkov to reproach deputies at a previous sitting for proposing more radical forms for ownership, but this was the mandate of the electorate to him and other deputies. In many places, there is no master of the land. This means that state ownership of the land is in many places a fiction. He opposes the referendum because he does not believe that the real users of the land would prevail in a referendum.

At 2053 GMT, Deputy Yudin says that the issue is full and proper use of all land resources and all natural resources, rather than just use of agricultural lands. It will be impossible if all users of land have different regulations for operation, he says. The law is vague in many cases about how land should be allocated to the must suitable user. The length of leases is also an issue that could be better clarified, he suggests.

At 2058 GMT, Deputy Kakhirov says that the role of the state in land ownership is not specified in the draft and that this problem should be investigated. Some lands are assigned to certain uses, but are more suitable for other uses which in many cases are ecologically more suitable. The economic role of the state in land conservation must be recognized, he believes.

At 2102 GMT, Deputy Kasyan says that the law on land is most important. Wars in the past were fought over land. The idea of buying land and selling land should be excluded because working people have no money to buy land. More consideration is needed. He suggests that there should not be a repetition of what happened with the cooperatives which have assaulted the pockets of ordinary people; the state must retain ownership of the land, he emphasizes.

Kasyan goes on to say that the principle of giving out allotments to people over 100 km from their place of residence is wrong. Not all people have the transport to travel such distances. Perhaps, state farms could be given land farther from the cities and ordinary people could be given allotments close to the cities. This way the food program could be fulfilled, he says.

At 2107 GMT, Deputy Denisov suggests proposing parallel draft laws so that deputies can decide which is better. The committee on ecology has a different idea on the law. He says that the law should recognise that allotments are worth different amounts in different places.

At 2108 GMT, Deputy Shlyakota says that an all-union law should be short enough to be clear but long enough to be precise. He would not like to go into specific provisions in the law. However, he feels that, considering the previous debate on ownership, that making autonomous areas have equal rights with union republics would mean reducing the authority of union republics. This is undesirable. Therefore, he believes that union republics must always take consideration of the wishes of autonomous republics and areas within them.

At 2115 GMT, Deputy Dubko takes the floor. He bewails the view widely held in rural areas that the land doesn't belong to anyone and this, he says, is why land which in countries like Austria would be given over to cultivation is left to weeds in the USSR. The same applies to the forests. He says he is from Belorussia and says that forests are being neglected there because they don't belong to anyone. All this, he says is because land, water, and forests are not paid for. Deputy Bisher then takes the floor. He doesn't feel that the draft can be adopted at its first reading. He points out that the Supreme Soviet doesn't have the power to decide the matter in a referendum—this is for the congress.

At 2128 GMT, Primakov says that because 20 more deputies want to speak, after Deputy Babchenko, he will hold a vote on either accepting the draft in its first reading or referring it back to committee. Deputy Babchenko takes the floor briefly.

At 2131 GMT, Primakov then asks who is in favor of ending the debate and asks for a registration. There are 393 deputies.

Drimakov answers several procedural questions. An unidentified deputy says that it's not fair that rural workers whose fate is being discussed here don't come to the rostrum very often and that when they do they are cut off. Primakov says that this matter is being decided democratically. The deputy is not convinced.

2139 GMT

LD2211234889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2139 GMT on 22 November continues its recorded relay of the USSR Supreme Soviet proceedings.

Primakov asks for a vote on whether to end the debate: For 303; against 48; abstentions 17.

At 2142 GMT, there is a vote on approving the draft in its first reading and referring it to committee for further elaboration. For—174; against—167; abstentions—26. The proposals are rejected.

At 2144 GMT, the deputies vote on returning the draft to committee for further elaboration and then returning it to the Supreme Soviet for approval in its first reading is held. For, 268; against 71; abstentions 30. The proposal passes. Primakov strongly urges deputies to take the most active part in the work of the committees.

An unidentified deputy complains that elementary democratic norms are not being observed concerning allowing people to speak in order. Primakov says this is not the case.

Primakov then hands the floor to Deputy Bunich to explain why certain proposals never got into the draft. He does this at length, citing suggested textual amendments, articles and clauses.

Bunich goes through the points, articles and clauses of the draft law on lease-contracting in the light of proposals made at today's sitting of the Supreme Soviet. He explains why the Committee on Agrarian Affairs decided things in a different way to what was suggested by deputies today. He apologizes for the lengthy clarifications, but it is necessary for deputies to understand why the Agrarian Committee made precisely the proposals which it did. All these issues were contemplated thoroughly, he asssures them. He proposes that a vote be taken.

At 2216 GMT, Primakov asks what exactly the issue is. Deputy Kirilov says that Bunich did not construe his remarks correctly when he responded. Bunich contests this.

At 2221 GMT, Deputy Rogatin says that many proposals have been made. However, he proposes leaving the voting until tomorrow. Primakov agrees that perhaps the vote should be left until tomorrow. Bunich says that there will be no change from this evening's position tomorrow morning.

More minor points are raised which Bunich answers.

At 2226 GMT, Primakov says that there will be no more debate on the draft law but that the vote will be postponed until tomorrow. However, some deputies want the vote today. Primakov calls for a vote on whether to have the vote about the draft law today or tomorrow. 126 vote for a final vote today; 225 vote against; and 11 abstain. So the final vote about adopting the draft law on lease-contracting is postponed until tomorrow.

At 2229 GMT, Primakov invites Nikolay Fedorov to speak about discussions in committees and commission about a decree on marking holidays.

Fedorov says that the deputies could not find any other parliament that spent so much time discussing professional holidays. So the commissions and committees decided that the USSR Supreme Soviet should not discuss such matters unless they are particularly controversial on a countrywide level. This issue is now something for the Council of Ministers to decide.

Primakov ends by saying that the deputies have worked well today. The Supreme Soviet will meet again tomorrow at 1000.

The recorded relay ends at 2233 GMT.

Further on 22 Nov Supreme Soviet Session

On Leaseholding, Land Bills

LD2211201289 Moscow TASS in English 1841 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet Parliament today started discussing the bill of the USSR and constituent republics on leaseholding, designed to decentralise ownership and give wider autonomy to labour collectives.

In particular, the bill decrees that all produce manufactured under leasing arrangements will belong to a labour collective, which also has the right to buy out the enterprise that it has leased from the state.

It was noted during the debates that early passage of the bill will help overcome negative trends in the Soviet economy. Pavel Bunich, who spoke on behalf of the six parliamentary committees and commissions, proposed

passing the bill without preliminary discussion and subsequent revision. The Parliament is expected to endorse the bill tomorrow after introducing all the amendments proposed today.

The Supreme Soviet also discussed the bill of the USSR and constituent republics on land, which aims to radically change the system of land tenure in the Soviet Union and provide legal basis for land relations in the country.

Presenting the legislation to deputies, Aleksandr Nikonov, president of the All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences, stressed that the bill codifies various forms of ownership in the agrarian sector, gives local soviets of people's power the exclusive right to dispose of land and its control. The bill introduces payment for land and envisages the possibility of leasing land by state and public organisations, as well as by individuals.

Parliamentary commissions failed to reach accord on the issue of land ownership, which has triggered the most heated debates. The Agrarian Committee proposed to write into the bill the notion of individual and labour ownership of land, but ban its purchase, sale or donation. But the Law Committee maintained that the most acceptable notion was life ownership of land that could be inherited.

During the debate the most diverse, sometimes diametrically opposed, viewpoints were expressed: From proposals to recognise private ownership of land to complete negation of all forms of ownership, except for by the state. It was said that such a bill should regulate the use of not only land but also the natural resources.

Considering the complex nature of the issue and its significance for the country's economy, the deputies decided not to approve the bill at its first reading and returned it for revision to the permanent bodies of the Parliament.

Sobchak on Lease-Contracting

LD2311043689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2029 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Speech by Deputy Sobchak, member of the Supreme Soviet Committee for Legislation, Legality and Law and Order; from the recorded relay of the 22 November evening session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin]

[Excerpts] Respected comrade deputies; today we are considering one of the very important laws, one of those which will really determine the fate of our country, both the political and the economic fate. For this reason it is extemely important to understand those concepts which are at the basis of the draft law. The draft law on land submitted to the Agrarian Committee, the Committee on Agrarian Issues, proceeds from a renunciation, in principle, of state ownership of land and introduces, together with the concept of state ownership, collective ownership of land and individual labor ownership of land of the appropriate peasant farm.

So that you can appraise the significance of these changes of those proposals which are contained in the draft law submittd to you it may be said that these changes completely change the structure of our, the structure of our economy. And this is why. Declaring a citizen or of a certain labor collective the owner of land means simultaneously investing him with certain rights in disposing of this land. The concept of ownership is indisolubly linked with such concepts as purchase and sale, donation, exchange, security, inheritance and other forms of disposal.

As is well-known, the right of ownership is the right to posess, use, and dispose of some sort of property at the will of the owner and in his interests. If the owner is deprived of this right, if the owner cannot either sell or exchange or submit as security or in any other way dispose of his property, then he cannot be considered the owner. And this is why the Committee on Legislation considers the basic shortcoming of the draft presented to you this internal contradiction which on the one hand invests the citizen and the collective with ownership but on the other hand in Article 3 proclaims that the purchase and sale, security and donation, unauthorized exchange of land and also the subleasing and other forms of paid secondary usage of land are prohibited.

But if all of this is prohibited, then nothing more remains of ownership. Then we, instead of the usual, traditional term of usage of land, are introducing the concept of ownership but this ownership will be so limited, so deprived of these obligatory indications of ownership that it will, in the true sense, cease to be ownership. For this reason, in essence, in the proposed version significant measures for substituting concepts are proposed to us, new formulations and not an essentially new state of affairs are proposed.

I will illustrate this with another example. Here in particular, Article 4 on state ownership of land proclaims the following, it says here: All lands not granted for collective and individual labor ownership are under state ownership. Let us interpret this clause. At first glance it seems correct. But at second glance, if you think about it attentively this is a formula which completely cancels out the proposals about collective and individual ownership. Who today is the owner of land in our country? The state. On whom will the issue of whether or not to grant ownership to the citizen or the collective of appropriate lands which today belong to the state depend? What will remain of ownership if the decision to grant this ownership will depend on the state?

In other words we are in essence keeping the same command approach to the distribution of land and to consolidating the ownership of it. I think that it is here not the formulation, not what we call what the peasant owns as property, but the determination of ways of conveying land, of the legal procedure for conveying

land, the real, complete ownership, utilization, and disposal by the peasant that is much more important for us today. For that reason I will go on to expound on the essence of the concept that was put forward by the Committee for Legislation. In proposing our version, that is, life-long, bequeathable ownership of land, as the basic form of land ownership, turning the peasant into the owner of the land, we started from the need to coordinate the draft law on ownership with the draft law on land and the draft law on leasing, so that all three laws would be based on one concept and start from the same general position.

I remind you that in discussing the draft law on ownership, Article 23, that we dwelt and got stuck on the wording on who would be the owner of the land. The main question to come up regarded the rights of the various autonomous and other national-state formations. You remember that we arrived at the formula of property of the people. We arrived at the formula that land is the inalienable property of the people—of the people that live in the given territory—and is not the state's or anyone else's property. And that the ownership, utilization, and disposal of the land belongs to the corresponding soviets of people's deputies. But under one indispensable condition: that the disposal of land by each more highly placed soviet—for example by the republic or by the Union—is allowed only with the agreement of that more lowly placed soviet of people's deputies of an autonomous republic, of an autonomous okrug, or a national okrug, which is the genuine owner of the land under discussion. We considered that this formula of words allows the interests of people—ethnic interests, to be coordianted with the interests of the specific owners and users of the land. [passage omitted]

In actual fact what will we get as a result of discussion by the whole people? We will get a large number of letters, a large number of articles, a large number of television and radio programs, but we will not clarify the genuine opinion of our people. We will not clarify what proportion of people would like us, for example, to have peasant ownership of the land or only ownership of the land for life. For that reason there is a proposal, and I am putting it forward for discussion by you. Perhaps for the first time we should, on this very question, take into consideraiton the extraordinary importance of this matter, hold a referendum of all the people and take a special decision by the Supreme Soviet on holding such a referendum so that every Soviet may answer one question: Is he for individual labor ownership of land or for keeping—let me put it like this, lifelong, bequeathable ownership of the land. Yes or no? [passage omitted]

Moscow TV Airs 23 November Supreme Soviet Session

1600 GMT

LD2311175189

[Editorial report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1600 GMT, on 23 November, begins carrying a recording from the USSR Supreme Soviet session 23 November, at the Kremlin in Moscow. The session is chaired by Anatoliy Lukyanov;405 deputies register as present. Lukyanov begins by saying that the leasing law committee worked late into the night and has circulated the amended draft law. The draft law on leasing is put to a vote: 372 are in favor, 5 are against, and 17 abstain. The law is passed.

A decision on how to implement the adopted law must be voted on. Deputy Nikolaychuk proposes an amendment to prevent the government from extending the list of enterprises that cannot be leased, Deputy Bunich explains that a provisional arrangement is included in the draft decision: the final list will be confirmed after a period of one month. An unidentified deputy says Nikolaychuk is attempting to do the government's work; the wording of the decision should be left as it stands.

At 1612 GMT, Lukyanov puts Nikolaychuk's proposal to a vote: 346 vote to retain the existing wording, 16 vote against, and 18 abstain.

At 1615 GMT, an unidentified deputy from Siberia proposes an amendment to extend the provisions of the leasing law to traditional industries in his area. A member of the committee proposes a general amendment "taking account of national interests and differences." This has been circulated with the draft decision. Lukyanov puts the matter to a vote: 338 support the circulated wording, 22 are against it, and 17 abstain. The circulated wording is adopted.

At 1622 GMT, an unidentified deputy proposes stipulating the introduction of new procurement prices for agriculture produce from 1 January. Bunich, for the leasing law committee, says that this is too important an issue to decide now.

Lukyanov says that he would like to hear the view of the prices commission on the subject. An unidentified speaker says that higher wholesale prices would increase retail prices.

At 1626 GMT, Deputy Gritsenko of the prices commission says that the issue of prices should be reviewed from the next 5-Year Plan period. It is too early as yet.

Lukyanov asks for Deputy Kucherenko's view as chairman of the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission. He says that the question of price changes was discussed during the budget work; the decision has already been taken to introduce new procurement prices from the beginning of 1991. It would be wrong to establish new prices in this one area in isolation. An unidentified deputy echoes this view. Another speaker says agricultural producers should set their own prices rather than having prices dictated from above. This would be a step toward a market mechanism.

AT 1633 GMT, Lukyanov summarizes the opinions heard thus far. Procurement prices are a complex issue, he says.

Deputy Motornyy complains that the March plenum of the Central Committee Called for new procurement prices from 1990. Why is this not being done?

At 1638 GMT, Lukyanov asks who is in favor of asking the commissions to work on a price review formula? He puts the existing wording of the relevant point in the draft decision to a vote: 209 are for, 134 against and 39 abstain. The proposal for a procurement price review is therefore rejected.

1641 GMT

LD2311183889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1641 GMT on 23 November continues its recording from the Kremlin in Moscow.

An unidentified deputy proposes an amendment asking the Council of Ministers to take measures to help those who lose their jobs in connection with leasing. Bunich says the committee considered this problem: Local authorities are responsible for finding jobs for such people. This is stated in the law. The deputy insists the matter should be stipulated in the decision on implementation. Other deputies support him in this.

Lukyanov agrees to instruct the commission to come up with an appropriate amendment to the draft decision. The amendment will be voted on later. The decision in its present wording is put to the vote: 345 are in favor, 20 are against, and 13 abstain. The draft decision on implementation is adopted.

At 1648 GMT, Lukyanov moves on to the decree on professional holidays. The ministries and committees have proposed cutting the number of holidays from 27 to 23. There is some controversy over whether Teacher's Day and Knowledge Day should be merged. Press Day is to be abolished. Lukyanov stresses that the draft decree has been agreed with all the bodies concerned. Various deputies are unhappy about scrapping people's professional holidays since one should not be contemptuous toward the working people. The debate becomes heated.

At 1659 GMT, Lukyanov asks the deputies to vote on the decree: 300 favor, 59 are against, and 12 abstain. The Supreme Soviet ends its first session of the day and a cartoon is televised for 15 minutes.

At 1715 GMT, Lukyanov announces that by a majority vote the Decree on Holidays has been adopted.

Lukyanov proposes that the Supreme Soviet discuss the ecological situation in the country and ways to utilize natural resources efficiently.

At 1719 GMT, Kakimbek Salykov from Uzbekistan begins a 25-minute report on the ecological situation. He is chairman of the Committee on Ecology and Rational Use of Natural Resources. He reiterates that perestroyka is necessary in this sphere. It is already proceeding, slowly but surely. The USSR is taking part in 55 ecological projects launched jointly with other countries, including with the United States. He says that for the moment it is necessary to increase the ecology budget up to three percent of gross income. In 103 cities the amount of harmful substances in the atmosphere is 10 or more times the standard. The ecological situation is poor in Kuzbass and other areas.

It is necessary, he says, to set up a quick program for ecological recovery. He then speaks on the importance of improving the situation on the Aral Sea. There are many projects to increase the sea level and save it. All possibilities must be utilized, including UNESCO resources and projects. A permanent government commission to supervise the introduction of environmental measures should be established.

Little attention is being paid to the introduction of purification installations at enterprises. Pesticides are still being used, and in the Caucasus its usage if five times higher than normal. Diseases related to allergies have increased considerably, he says.

The situation with potable water is not good, especially in Uzbekistan. In some areas it is in short supply. In others it is polluted. The committee proposes to set up a program to monitor the use of drinking water.

At 1735 GMT, Salykov says it is necessary to introduce crimes against the environment into the legal code.

Over 1 million hectares of forest are damaged. A state program needs to be set up to oversee its restoration.

Personnel are needed in the sphere of ecology, and education in environmental protection should be organized. Journals should brief the public on the environmental situation should also be established.

At 1744 GMT, Salykov finishes his report.

1744 GMT

LD2311193189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1744 GMT, on 23 November, continues its recording from the Kremlin in Moscow.

An unidentified deputy sitting next to Lukyanov suggests that speakers in the ensuing debate should be concise.

Deputy Amanova from Turkmenistan opens the debate on Salykin's proposals, refining the formulations of certain proposals on the use of energy and the setting up of legislation for crimes against the environment. Amanova says priority should be given to the question of the environment she then proposes that funding for environmental issues should be better thought out and envisaged in the next 5-Year Plan.

At 1751 GMT, Deputy Zalygin of NOVYY MIR takes the floor. He talks about the procedure for selecting experts for environmental inspection bodies. He speaks

about the need for stringent supervision of how environmental projects are implemented and which ones are put into action. Zalygin concludes his speech by mentioning the need to stop irrigating land mindlessly.

At 1759 GMT, Deputy Mongo from Krasnoyarsk complains about how poor the environmental situation is in the areas of the North. Many species of animals have fallen sharply in numbers. Reindeer breeding has become difficult because reindeer find it difficult to adapt to modern breeding and farming methods.

Mongo says the socioeconomic infrastructure should be strengthened in the North. Meat processing is poor throughout the country, but the industry is even worse in the North. Forests are being damaged by fire. Statistics on forest fires are not only unavailable but do not exist. Aviation should be available to help control forest fires.

At 1805 GMT, Deputy Zelinskiy from Odessa introduces other formulations to some of Salykin's proposals concerning potable water, the Black Sea and the Azov Sea. No chemical industry or other enterprises should be built on its shores.

At 1810 GMT, Nishanov reads out deputies' proposals regarding the law on leasing.

At 1813 GMT, Deputy Militenko from Stavropol comments on the need to preserve resort areas. At present most of them are degenerating. Mineral water springs are being polluted. She suggests resorts be treated as nature-protection zones.

At 1816 GMT, Deputy Dementey from Belorussia supports the proposal of working out a long-term state environmental program. He says that radionuclides have contaminated areas of Belorussia populated by 2 million people. In other words, a massive decontamination task has been created which will require large financial resources. Therefore the Belorussian Supreme Soviet is asking the USSR Supreme Soviet to approve the 1990 program for eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl accident in Belorussia. The program envisages better health care for those affected by the accident. He asks for the USSR Supreme Soviet to adopt a special decision separate from any other ecological measures.

At 1823 GMT, Deputy Vyucheyskiy from the Nenets Autonomous Okrug, talks about a test site other than Semipalatinsk near the Barents Sea and Pacific Ocean on Novaya Zemlya Island and says that (?50,000) signatures have been collected and handed over to the Supreme Soviet about this. He wants to know why the opinion of the local population has no significance. He asks for a cessation of testing on Novaya Zemlya Island, saying that the number of oncological illnesses in the area has increased. Deer-hunting is a local industry, yet the deer are being contaminated by radionuclides. The unidentified deputy repeats his call for a cessation of testing both in Semipalatinsk and on Novaya Zemlya and ends.

1829 GMT

LD2311213389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1829 GMT on 23 November continues its recording from the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Shcherbak from Kiev says that the ecological situation is serious in the Ukraine. The birth rate in the Ukraine is the lowest in the USSR. Life expectancy is several years lower than in the West. Donetsk, Ivanofrankovsk, Cherkassk, Poltava, and others have seen an increase in oncological and hematological illnesses. Twenty-five percent of all the country's waste is emitted here. Clean power is being exported and pollution remains at home. We need socialism with an ecological face. The republican authorities must begin governing their land—the monopoly of the ministries and departments must end.

At 1833 GMT, Shcherbak says that thousands of Ukrainian people are demanding to leave zones affected by the Chernobyl accident. He cites increases in illnesses, including "Atomic AIDS". He wants Chernobyl to be thoroughly discussed at the fall session of the Supreme Soviet. He thanks Greenpeace for offering to help with the problem of Chernobyl. He wants Soviet labratories to be opened to Western scientists. He speaks of protests by and petitions from concerned people about Chernobyl and the construction of nuclear energy stations. We have become hostages of technology. He quotes from a Tatar newspaper which cites young people as saying they want to use violence to stop the Tatar nuclear power station.

He calls today's decision a first, timid step, and shows a picture of a mutant calf from Zhitomir Oblast. He wants to know why Chazov and the chairman of Goskompriroda [State Committee for the Protection of Nature] is not here.

At 1840 GMT, Deputy Auyelbekov from Kazakhstan wishes that Ryzhkov would express his opinion on ecology. He emphasizes that this is noble discussion, but it is only the beginning. Auyelbekov thinks that it is necessary that this Supreme Soviet should discuss the state ecological program in preparation for the third session. He believes that Goskompriroda should be subordinated to the Supreme Soviet. He says that measures concerning the Aral Sea have been half-hearted and calls for efforts to sort out the Aral to be consolidated. If they are not, Auyelbekov warns, the Aral Sea will be gone in 10 years.

At 1845 GMT, Auyelbekov goes on to talks about the Semipalatinsk test site. He supports the Kazakh Supreme Soviet decision calling for a cessation of tests there. He calls for the site to be closed by 1990. He suggests Ryzhkov come and visit Semipalatinsk and the Aral Sea.

At 1847 GMT, Deputy Velantin Rasputin from Irkutsk says that the threshhold of fear has already been overstepped; figures on ecological catastrophes already mean

nothing. He agrees with Shcherbak that the issue of nuclear stations should be discussed at the next session. Only talking about eliminating the consequences of nuclear accidents will not stop another one. He says more money was spent on 3-Mile Island than on the much greater accident at Chernobyl. Five oil and gas complexes have been built in Tyumen—another ecological catastrophe in the making.

There has recently been a Politburo decision to increase construction of such complexes, although experts say that they have not been properly prepared. Rasputin states. Two and a half years ago a decision was made about the Baykal and yet the situation is now worse, he says.

At 1855 GMT, Rasputin criticizes ministries for polluting the Baykal. Destruction of forests is now taking place in Siberia as well as the European part of the USSR. Rasputin says he is a conchairman of the Baykal movement. He proposes that Minvodstroy [Water Resources Construction Ministry] should be turned into a ministry of village construction so thta it stops wasting billions of rubles.

At 1858 GMT, (?Akayev) summarizes what has been said. He says that we must not make the same mistakes again. He wants to talk about Lake Isyk-Kul'. He says it is unique, and he quotes a Russian geographer who calls it a "Pearl of Central Asia."

He reports that the depth of the lake has fallen dozens of meters this year. He says that glaciers are melting. He says that the republican government has more than once proposed uniting all the forces of the USSR to rectify the situation. He proposes forming a resort zone at the lake and to vote on making the lake a nature zone for special use.

(?Akayev) quotes letters to him on the construction of a cement factory in the area without expert advice; 150,000 people live in his valley and he supports the opinion of his electorate not to allow the cement factory without study by experts of its impact.

1906 GMT

LD2311220589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1906 GMT on 23 November continues its recording from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1907 GMT, Deputy Ivanov from Yakutsk talks about local industrial pollution. Pollution is harming deer hunting, which is a local industry. He recounts the increases in illnesses and says that the life expectancy has fallen by 3 years. He calls for measures to improve the ecological situation in south west Yakutia. The Pearl and Gold Association must pay compensation for polluting the Vilyuy river. Nuclear explosions in Yakutia for oil and gas prospecting have been a waste of time. No economic benefits were obtained, although the environment has been damaged. The situation must be investigated.

At 1915 GMT, Deputy Mukhtarov from (?Tashkent) begins to speak about the Aral Sea. The draft decision is a major step toward rescuing it, he believes, and reviews the damage done and potential disaster. Pollution is bad in many cities, and lists various guilty ministries. River pollution in Uzbekistan is also bad: copper concentrations are 10-100 times higher than the acceptance level. Central bodies are saying that enterprises must finance their own environmental measures, but many enterprises do not have the resources. Mukhtarov has prepared a package of proposals for submission to the relevant bodies; and quickly summarizes his proposed measures. He concludes by saying he will vote for the draft decision.

At 1923 GMT, Deputy Shchelkanov from Leningrad notes that the document makes no mention of noise pollution. He thinks this point should be added to the draft. He proposes other changes to the wording, including a recommendation that a study should be made in 1990 by the state of all nuclear-powered ships. Radiation measurement devices should be made generally available to citizens.

At 1931 GMT, Deputy Khudonazarov from Dushanbe considers ecology is a moral issue. The draft decision is a good one, but for it to be more than a piece of paper, the state Committee for the Protection of Nature should be given higher status.

At 1934 GMT, Deputy Oleynik from Kiev is next to speak. Looking back at the Chernobyl accident, he says that things would have been much better if people had been given information. He therefore proposes an amendment obliging the authorities to inform the public of all such accidents, even the smallest.

At 1937 GMT, Nishanov announces an adjourment, which is followed by 19-minutes of other programming.

At 1958 GMT, an unidentified deputy says that no committee has properly examined the text of a decision on glasnost and legality. Lukyanov says that two possible texts have been circulated. Another unidentified deputy says that the text of the law on the press was not properly processed, although the text was distributed to deputies. Lukyanov wonders what the problem is and suggests that all the versions be examined.

At 2004 GMT, Deputy Petrushenko, a lieutenant-Colonel from Kazakhstan, calls for emergency measures to be employed in the "disaster zones" of the century. He suggests a special tax should be paid by polluting enterprises. He points to the deforestation of Kazakhstan, and adds: still the USSR continues to export timber. A large number of enterprises and organizations possess radiation-emitting equipment. The radioactivity often ends up in garbage dumps and elsewhere from time to time. Storage of radioactive waste is a great problem today: No

one wants storage sites nearby. He calls for the formation of a special group of deputies from radiation-affected areas who would then go to the U.S. Congress and talk to Congressmen about the dangers of nuclear production and the arms race. At home, the production of radiation-measuring devices would help to dispel radiation phobia.

At 2016 GMT, Deputy Arutyunyan talks about the plight of Lake Sevan, which is being polluted by 40 enterprises. The destruction of any lake is a disaster for humanity, not just for the local people.

At 2020 GMT, Deputy Rubiks from Riga talks about the need for the construction of local ecology-monitoring stations, such as those which have been built in Latvia. There is also a need for foreign currency to be given to local bodies that service foreign shipping, for example. It should not just be given to the relevant ministry. Water meters should be installed in all new apartment buildings, he says.

At 2027 GMT, Deputy Barsov from Kursk draws attention to the state of the Caspian Sea and the Apsheron Peninsula and says that special provision should be made for them in the measures to be taken.

2030 GMT

LD2311224889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2030 GMT on 23 November continues its recording from the Kremlin in Moscow.

Deputy Yevtukh from Minsk talks about the radioactive pollution in parts of Belorussia resulting from Chernobyl. He quotes figures relating to the scale of the disaster and the relief measures adopted. The people have suffered pyschologically as well as physically. Funds for rehabilitation work must come from the country as a whole, since the Belorussian people are not to blame for the disaster.

At 2037 GMT, Deputy Neyelov from Tyumen Oblast speaks of local concern over the construction and siting of petrochemical installations. People want to know whether an installation will be financially useful and ecologically clean.

At 2039 GMT, Deputy Shakhanov from Alma-Ata talks about the state of affairs in the Aral Sea area. Not everything can be blamed on the period of stagnation, since half-baked decisions are still being made, he says. He continues on Semipalatinsk, which he says is a constant source of concern to the people of Kazakhstan.

At 2045 GMT, Deputy Velikhov from Moscow talks about the ozone situation over the Antarctic and the phenomenon of global warming. The rise in global temperature threatens the world with large-scale drought, which will affect the USSR. There is a clear need, he thinks, to allocate funds to means of saving energy. Energy will be saved when local bodies have much more responsibility. An integrated power program must be devised and implemented. He draws attention to the huge debts that have accumulated during the drive to build up the USSR's stockpile of nuclear weapons. Nuclear testing must end, and agreement must be sought with the United States.

At 2058 GMT, Deputy Balayan from Yerevan voices satisfaction at the fact that Health Minister Chazov is now in the hall. He quotes Chazov as blaming 80 percent of all diseases in the USSR on poor drinking water. The USSR's greatest freshwater stock is held in Lake Baykal. The USSR has appealed to the United Nations to extend its worldwide drinking water program, so that the USSR can benefit, since nothing much has been done in the past 10 years.

At 2103 GMT, USSR Deputy Prime Minister Doguzhiyev says that the government is working hard on a package of emergency measures to remedy the ecological situation. Much has already been said about Chernobyl; 116,000 people were resettled. Measures are also required to protect the people still living in the affected region. It was decided that people should be forced to leave the stricken area. The question remains, though: What is to be done with the people who are living in areas that are only slightly affected, but are not to be regarded as normal. In general, he expresses satisfaction with the measures taken.

As for Belorussia, there may be no need for a separate decision on the area. He urges that there should not be any sudden, emotional call for the closure of installations such as the Semipalatinsk test facility. The question must be well thought out. A rational solution must be found. He feels that there is no point in the endless multiplication of commissions. Who is to coordinate their activities? He asks. The Aral Sea problem will not be solved by the mere creation of a commission. Different committees may well duplicate each other's work. The government is also working on the problem of radioactive waste. Points raised by Velikhov are included in the measures being drawn up, Doguzhiyev concludes.

At 2127 GMT, Deputy Kaipergenov from Kara Kalpak takes up the point about the Aral Sea. The inhabitants of the region are threatened, he says. One cannot play with their lives—more resolute measures are required to save the Aral Sea. It should be declared an ecological disaster zone by the decision on ecological measures.

At 2134 GMT, Sakharov speaks from the floor. Nuclear energy, he says, is essential in the long term. It must be safe, however. Reactors should be placed underground. Sakharov proposes a 5-year moratorium on nuclear station construction apart from underground reactors. Although the last nuclear test moratorium brought no results, a new 'long-term' moratorium should be announced along with unilateral disarmament measures. The international situation has changed sufficiently for this to bring success. Sakharov is applauded.

At 2141 GMT, Nishanov asks whether the debate should continue; 52 are in favor; 257 against. The debate ends.

2143 GMT

LD2311230989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2143 GMT on 23 November continues its recording from the Kremlin in Moscow. Deputy Salykov responds to questions on the ecological measures proposed. Various written questions are read out and handled briefly. He defends the provisions in his report concerning the Aral Sea.

At 2148 GMT, Nishanov summarizes: Most of the speakers have supported the draft decision, he says, though many additional proposals have been made.

At 2152 GMT, Deputy Semukha from Minsk, supports Shcherbak's suggestion that the Chernobyl program should be discussed separately at the spring session of the Supreme Soviet. He then complains to Nishanov that no Belorussians have been allowed to speak today. Nishanov denies this: Two Belorussians have spoken and he has shown no bias for or against any republic during the debate. Deputy Priymachenko from Kiev talks on the Chernobyl clear-up program: The decision should specify financing for the program throughout the 13th 5-Year Plan. The resettlement operation should be accelerated.

At 2157 GMT, Deputy Suleymenov from Alma-Ata states that the "Damocles' sword" of nuclear war still exists. Sakharov is right to propose a new test moratorium. He proposes setting up a legislative association for a nuclear-free world and taking part in international anti-nuclear associations. An unidentified deputy says that the draft should mention the harmful use of agricultural chemicals.

At 2205 GMT, Deputy Yablokov from Moscow says the country has waited 40 years for these environmental measures and it is wrong to rush through the debate and voting. More time should be allocated. Deputy Burykh from the Ecology Committee says that many valuable contributions have not yet been included in the draft, despite the work his committee did during the break.

At 2210 GMT, Nishanov suggests adopting the draft as a basis. All the suggestions made can be considered over the next 2-3 days and then put to a vote. There should also be a vote on Suleymenov's proposal to set up an anti-nuclear association.

The draft is put to a vote: 352 are in favor, 5 are against, and 6 abstain. The draft decision on ecological measures is endorsed. The Ecology Committee will now finalize the text taking today's proposals into account.

At 2215 GMT, Lukyanov speaks. He says Deputy Petrushenko has asked about the U.S. Congress' reaction to the appeal adopted by the first session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and notes that no response has been received thus far.

At 2217 GMT, Deputy Mokanu makes some organizational announcements.

At 2219 GMT, Nishanov declares the session closed and the televised recording ends.

Further on 23 Nov Supreme Soviet Session

Lukyanov Chairs Session

LD2311080589 Moscow TASS in English 0748 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Soviet Parliament again gathered today for a joint sitting of the two chambers, chaired by First Vice-President Anatoliy Lukyanov. Deputies approved the fundamentals of the legislation of the USSR and union republics on leasing, which was discussed on Wednesday. In addition, Parliament will consider urgent measures to improve the country's ecological situation. It also plans today to examine draft provisions on the order of applying measures to combat crime under critical conditions and amendments to the fundamentals of criminal procedure of the USSR and union republics.

Adopts Leasing Law

LD2311113189 Moscow TASS in English 1051 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 23 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

In what is considered as a resolute step towards overcoming excessive centralisation of the Soviet economy and loosening the state's grip, the national parliament today adopted principles of federal and republican legislation on leasing.

The law on leasing is the first legal act from the proposed package of fundamental legislation to form the basis of economic reform in the USSR.

The development of leasing, a new form of economic management in the Soviet Union, has been until now restrained by the absence of a corresponding legal basis and officialdom that refused to give up its monopoly on enterprises.

The principles, to enter into force on January 1, 1990, envisage for the first time that all output produced on a lease basis belongs to the work collective involved. The work collective may buy out an enterprise it had leased from the state.

Leasing is allowed in all branches of the national economy. In contrast with the past, government agencies lose the right to "veto" the transfer of state-owned property to lease-holders.

Contrary to the established parliamentary practice in keeping with which bills are first approved in the first reading and are adopted only after extra editing in committees and commissions, the bill on leasing was first discussed only yesterday and adopted this morning.

"The principles of legislation on leasing is the first real step towards the transfer of economic authority to work collectives," said Sergey Alekseyev, chairman of the Parliamentary Committee for Legislation.

"Leasing will lead to the formation of commodity-market relations and will make it possible to change the economic situation in the country for the better as soon as next year," Alekseyev said.

He pointed out that the law contains firm guarantees of the rights of lease-holders and totally excludes the possibility of "expropriation" in the future.

It says that any changes in legislation would not affect the status of the lease-holder throughout the period of a lease contract.

Defining that all products become property of the people working under a lease contract, the law makes the workers be genuinely interested in the results of their work, stressed Pavel Bunich, a leading Soviet economist.

During debate, many deputies remarked that the principles should be put into effect along with a system of taxation of lease-contract enterprises.

In this connection the USSR Council of Ministers was assigned to adopt by the beginning of next year a temporary ordinance on payments by lease-contract enterprises into the budget and submit a corresponding bill to parliament before February 1, 1990.

Commenting at TASS request on the new legislative act, Valentin Vologzhin, chairman of the Parliament Committee on Economic Reform, said that it creates equal starting opportunities for work in new economic conditions for all enterprises, including those whose financial position is now unsatisfactory.

The principles of legislation on leasing will be of special importance for increasing the efficiency of the country's agriculture.

23 Nov Supreme Soviet Addresses

Shcherbak Speech

LD2411004389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1829 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Speech by Deputy Yuriy Shcherbak at the 23 November session of the USSR Supreme Soviet at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] The sharp worsening of the ecological situation and the level of people's health has turned into an ethnic and social disaster my once flurishing and wonderful homeland—the Ukraine. The average life expectancy for men is 7-8 years lower and for women 4-6 years lower than in the highly-developed countries. Birth defects have increased from 6 to 13 per thousand new-born children, and the birth-rate itself is the lowest in the USSR and is falling. [passage omitted]

A rise in illness among pregnant women has been noticed. The number of spontaneous abortions has increased by four to six times. On average, 40,000 women in the Ukraine do not see their pregnancy through and do not know the happiness of motherhood. Is this not a tragedy for the people, in whose eyes the eternal threat of life is breaking?

On the territory of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic zones of ecological disaster have been formed in industrial areas such as the Donetsk, Zaporozhye, Dnepropetrovsk, Ivanofrankovst Oblast, where a vinyl chloride combine has been built at Kalush, Cherkasskaya Oblast, Poltava, in Poltava Oblast where the Kremenchug Pyrotartaric acid plant exists, and so forth. An increase in oncological illnesses among children has been registered here. Comrades, imagine!—the oncological sickness rate of children. And blood diseases are five to eight times higher than the average statistical level.

The causes of this are evident. On the territory of the Ukraine, constituting about 3 percent of the total area of the country, 25 percent of nuclear reactors are concentrated, 25 percent of the industrial and agricultural potential of the USSR, with, correspondingly 25 percent of all harmful emissions and pollution in the country. Giving away for export clean electric power we, figuratively speaking, are leaving waste ash for ourselves.

Well, I can add that over the last 20-30 years in the Ukraine 20,000 little rivulets have disappeared while 1,000 chemical plants have been built which are poisoning the air. [passage omitted]

Only new union treaties and a new federation will present the possibility of breaking with the colonial, monopolistic omnipotence of the central ministries and departments which are ravaging the country and confidently leading us along the path to ecological ruin. [passage omitted]

Today people are justly demanding—tens of thousands of people, living in the Polesskiy Rayon of Kiev Oblast, in the Marodichskiy and Luginskiy Rayons of Zhitomir Oblast and other rayons of several oblasts—resettlement from infected zones just as is happening on the lands of fraternal Belorussia.

I want to tell you, comrades, that 1.5 million people, including 160,000 children, have radiation levels in their thyroid gland over 30 rems, and 2 percent of adults and 17 percent of children have over 100 rems—all the way

up to 1,000 or 2,000 rems per thyroid gland. On extensive areas contaminated with radioactivity the children's sickness rate in pneumonia and bronchitis are increasing in serious and chronic forms. Growth in the number of cases of anemia, hypertrophia of the thyroid gland and cataracts is also noted. There is plenty of cause to talk of the appearance of cases of immune deficiency, of so-called atomic AIDS. Not long ago this was all secret data, because official medicine—for three years after the accident—lulled society with nightingales' trills of state optimism. [passage omitted]

A letter came to us, to the Ecology committee, and a clipping from the KOMSOMOLETS TATARII. In a note under the title Apocalypse—how it will be in Kazan—it is recounted how some man came up to an ecological protester collecting signatures against the construction of the Tatar Nuclear Electric Power Station (AES) and said, 'You will achieve nothing by signatures. You need terror, otherwise you won't get through to them. There are weapons and people.' The author of the letter adds: 'We do not want to be hostages to atomic madness,' and therefore many are on the side of this young man who is prepared to blow up this AES, and I think they will blow it up. [passage omitted]

Ivanov Speech

LD2411050589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1907 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Remarks by Yakutsk Deputy Kliment Yegorovich Ivanov at the 23 November USSR Supreme Soviet Session at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] I wish to say a few words about underground nuclear explosions. I understand and share the concern of Semipalatinsk residents, but how is it possible to understand underground nuclear explosions outside well-equipped testing grounds of this kind? The attempts to intensify the exploration of oil and gas by means of nuclear explosions have not yielded much of anything. From 1973 onward, on the territory of Yakutiya, 12 underground nuclear explosions have been carried out. I put a question to Comrade Belousov, deputy chairman, during the first session of the Supreme Soviet as to what scientific institute had developed and on what economic grounds it had given the recommendation to make use of underground nuclear explosions in permafrost conditions, and what the guarantees were that they were safe for the environment. I did not receive any specific reply then, except for mere listing of nuclear explosions that were carried out. Incidentally, the experts of the institute the only one in the union that specializes in permafrost and that is situated in Yakutsk had not even been informed, let alone consulted.

Scientists in permafrost know that in the permafrost layer there is always water capable of melting and migrating along the underground veins. They have many cracks and tectonic breaks. In addition, the area where the last seven underground explosions have been carried out is a watershed between the major rivers Lena and Vilyuy. Comrades, we have gained practically nothing from these explosions in terms of economic benefit. Nature has been crippled. However, serious damage has been caused to the environment. [passage omitted]

The electorate in my constituency, the working people of the republic, are demanding that additional measures be adopted in the areas where the explosions have been carried out, to ensure full safety for the environment, that underground nuclear explosions in permafrost conditions under the guise of production needs to be fully stopped, and that the voluntarist actions of the organizers and executors of this antipeople act be convicted and made legally responsible for what they have done. Comrades, because of what has happened we are asking for a concrete investigation of and intervention in the actions regarding the environmental situation in the Yakut Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic of Comrade Doguzhiyev and Comrade Vorontsov, who occupy senior posts in the USSR Council of Ministers, and I am also asking you to take into account my proposals in the final variant of the draft decision. Thank you for your attention.

Doguzhiyev Speech

LD2411003489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2103 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Speech by Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at the 23 November USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] There is one question which I'd like to discuss with you, which has been very hotly disputed today: The question of the Semipalatinsk test site. Undoubtedly this issue is just as contentious an issue, in every aspect, perhaps slightly less than Chernobyl. But I understand today, by the number of agitated minds, that this is probably a very significant event.

Let us nevertheless agree that we must not snatch a problem out of our whole conglomeration of problems, especially because this is such a specific problem; I don't think we should attempt to solve issues on emotions. And, of course, when there are comrades speaking, deputies saying: Who owns the land in our country? Well, let's adopt a resolution and that's it. Then I'd answer that the land is owned by the same entity that owns everything in our country and which also is responsible for the defense capacity of the country: Our people.

Therefore, we should not heat things up like this and say let's close it and that's it. We did not test for 1 and ½ years. You know this. How did it end? You also know. We lagged behind in the improvement of arms. And, of course, we support the cessation of all nuclear tests. And, indeed, I think we should pursue several paths here. The first means somehow, once again—the comrades here proposed correctly—appearing before the U.S. congress, going there, meeting there, and attempting to solve this question. The second path is what we proposed today

and what is already being realized: To investigate the Semipalatinsk test site from all angles—the question was raised here about Novaya Zemlya, which we have not studied, but because such an issue exists, we will study it—to investigate it completely, and install an apparatus. Incidentally, we have already partially installed an aparatus there in the Semipalatinsk area to find out what radiation background levels and what emissions there are there.

And today, I think there is a greater factor even: the earthquake, seismic influence. It is not an earthquake, but seismic influence from the blast. And, as it is proposed here, in the 1st quarter, to report the Council of Ministers' proposals to the Supreme Soviet.

I think that at present, we cannot think of anything else. After all, with your permission, how can we ban, cease, and put an end to it? I think that together we must find a sensible solution. If we find a solution which enables us to combine both one requirement and the second, then, I think, that is just what we want.

Therefore, I beg that the paragraph which is written in the draft decision giving a task to the Council of Ministers to establish measures and to report to the Supreme Soviet on this test site in the 1st quarter be adopted. We have said that we cannot do anything else at the moment. We have been occupied with this issue for a sufficiently long time already but there are still no serious proposals. We understand that we must deal with this issue. [passage omitted]

Sahkarov Speech

LD2411045189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2134 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Speech by Andrey Sakharov at the 23 november USSR Supreme Soviet session at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] I will cut my speech by leaving out the introductory section. I will speak specifically about two problems: First, about nuclear power engineering. Nuclear power engineering is necessary in the long term because neither energy-saving technologies nor alternative sources of energy solve the energy problems in the first half of the 21st century completely. But nuclear power engineering must be safe. It must be safe with respect to possible accidents. All assessments of promising reactors provide very low figures for the probability of these accidents, but these figures are not entirely trustworthy, because accidents happen in a totally unpredictable manner—I am talking about big accidents—and we have repeatedly had a lot of trouble over this. The gigantic tragedy of Chernobyl came, in general, as a complete surprise to us. It should be safe with respect to terrorists and terrorist acts as well. This is a perfectly real problem. It has already been mentioned here and does not need repeating. Finally, safety in a conventional war involving the use of conventional weapons must also be taken into account. The siting of nuclear reactors underground is a vital solution. I will not repeat the discussion that will have to take place about this.

I will say that there exists [changes thought] my view is that the problems existing here can be resolved. The cost of these stations is more highly acceptable, and in the 21st century, when nuclear power engineering will be essential to us, this really will be a solution. My suggestions on nuclear power engineering, in accordance with what has already been said here by Deputy Shcherbak, are to declare a moratorium on the construction of nuclear electric and heat-supplying stations for a term of 5 years pending a solution and the development of truly safe nuclear electric and heat-supplying stations, apart from a pilot atomic power station with an underground sitting of its nuclear reactors. The Council of Ministers and the state planning committee should make relevant changes to the yearly and 5-year plans for the development of the USSR. Big and serious changes will be required here, indeed, now that we are carrying out perestroyka and proceeding from the principle that ecological issues have priority over economic development issues this is something we can achieve. In any case we need to carry out a very major review of our plans and our 13th 5-year period will undoubtedly be different from the way it appears now. Finally, the Council of Ministers must urgently carry out work on designing and constructing experimental nuclear electric power stations with an underground sitting of the nuclear reactors.

The second matter is that of nuclear tests. For a long time I expressed the view that this issue, within the overall complex of disarmament problems, was not the most important, but now the situation has changed. It is known that the 18-month moratorium that our country declared produced no results and that we had to cancel it. The situation has now changed; the ideas of the new political thinking have been developed and supported much further and trust in our country is now completely different from what it was few year ago. I believe that if we were to announce a moratorium—a unilateral moratorium on the conducting of nuclear tests—it would bring a response as long as two conditions are observed. First, it could not be a short-term moratorium, but a prolonged one, virtually indefinite. We must achieve a breakthrough in public opinion. That is the first thing. Second, the moratorium would have to be backed up by other unilateral disarmament steps. In the existing political situation we can do this without breaching our security. I agree with Deputy Velikhov when he says that the matter of nuclear tests is, first and foremost, not an ecological issue, but I am saying this at today's sitting since the issue has been raised here and besides really is a very important issue for the future social peace in our country. The problems, when I spoke to Reagan and Teller about these problems, their arguement in favor of SDI, and thereby in favor of continuing nuclear tests—these things are very closely linked—was as follows: You are conducting this work and therefore we are obliged to as well. This is a vicious circle that we must smash. [applause]

Gorbachev Chairs Supreme Soviet Session 24 Nov

LD2411074889 Moscow TASS in English 0730 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 24 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The full Supreme Soviet chaired by President Mikhail Gorbachev gathered here to today to discuss a bill on economic independence of the Soviet Baltic republics.

The parliament discussed the bill's first reading at its summer session.

The deputies are also expected to begin to debate a bill on the press.

Gorbachev on Baltics Draft Law

LD2411154889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Excerpts] Deputies at today's Supreme Soviet morning session discussed the draft law on economic independence in the Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian republics.

During the discussion, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who was chairing the morning session, was obliged from time to time to say few words to ensure that the heated discussion should become more businesslike and constructive, as for example in the following case:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] I do not think that the start of the discussion promises that we will reach the optimal solution which would be in the interests of the whole union, and at the same time would give the possibility of arriving at the adoption of a solution of what we began at the first session with the first reading. I think that the approaches of eyeball-to-eyeball and hammer and tongs is no style or method for the Supreme Soviet, or in general, for our public life and political process today. I would like us to listen to each other. I think this: That the Supreme Soviet should travel along the main path, and the main path is that we are in favor of federation, but a federation which is transformed, filled with content as far as concerns sovereignty, rights, and duties, as far as concerns economic autonomy, and so on. So let us seek this out.

I think that this draft law we are discussing here today on these republics is an important step along the path of this search. Therefore, I would not belittle the importance of what is taking place here, but it is necessary to seek out and harmonize interests here, and not bring in those questions which should be examined on a different occasion when other documents are being adopted which, by the way, have already been discussed here and put forward for discussion.

I request the comrades to respond to my appeal so that we can arrive at a law which would take account of the interests and, I would say, reflect the consensus of the Supreme Soviet, and which would harmonize the interests on the whole of the republics and the union, and so on. Let us seek it out and listen to each other. [end recording] [pasage omitted]

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev summed up the results of the discussion. He said, in particular:

[Begin Gorbachev recording] I think that the situation is clear from the point of view of the positions. Subsequent discussion shows that specific speeches actually revolve round the positions taken here. That is why, if one is to sum up the results in this way, briefly, then, first and foremost, the question that is under discussion is, indeed, an important and major one. I think that everyone is interested that the best possible law is adopted as far as this question is concerned.

The draft that emerged as a result of the work done by the Consultative Commission was put in doubt—thus it needs to be examined and adopted—in any case it can be discussed, but, as for adopting it, it can be done after the laws pertaining to ownership, federation, and so forth have been adopted.

Others—including, above all, the representatives of the republics that asked the Supreme Soviet to be given a right to carry out this experiment and to have the law on economic independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia adopted—they also see the draft that has been submitted as a document that fails to satisfy them. Hence, I think, all the difficulties that manifested themselves in the discussion, difficulties that are understandable; hence the contradictory nature of the positions—but the contradictions are real.

We are taking a very important step with regard to perestroyka and along this important direction. It is a step toward giving a real and new content to our federation. It will proceed along the path of expanding rights as pertains to the sovereignty of the republics, political and state rights, and state formations. It will touch upon the economic rights and the economic independence of republics. It will touch upon what pertains to the cultural and linguistic sphere, and so on.

How are we to get out of this situation so as to remove the concerns? I think that it is necessary to single out and enshrine in the law only that which is genuinely essential for the implementation of economic independence.

Let us not overburden this law with issues which go beyond the confines of this subject matter. I think that it is precisely this overburdening, the presence of these elements—moreover, comrades from the three republics also put our way a second variant recently, in addition to the document that had earlier been adopted in the first reading, and it seemed to me that the deputies that took the floor mainly criticized precisely this variant because it was at their disposal, the first one to have been discussed, the one that was amplified by the consultative commission—not everyone was even able properly to study this amplified variant.

Thus, what is the conclusion? Is there a way out on the basis of the discussion that has taken place? I think there is. In connection with this I think that we—the Supreme Soviet—could, on the basis of what has taken place during our morning sitting, we could instruct the government, together with the committees that were dealing with this issue, to take into account all the concerns voiced here, and nevertheless submit to the Supreme Soviet, by Monday, a slimmed-down and agreed-upon variant so as to get thing moving forward, comrades. [end recording]

More on Baltic Autonomy

LD2411120289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0900 GMT on 24 November, in its "Soyuz" program, carries a Gennadiy Kolenov report from the USSR Supreme Soviet session. "Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who is chairing this session, put forward for discussion a draft law, recalling that it had been approved by the Supreme Soviet in its first reading, on the economic independence of the Lithuanian, Latvian and Estonian Soviet Socialist Republics." Vologzhin, chairman of the Committee for Economic Reform, told how the draft had been prepared and proposed its adoption. Kalmykov of the Committee for Legislation, Legality and Law and Order, and Vilkas of the Commission for the Social and Economic Development of the Union Republics, supported the draft.

"Deputy Valov, representing the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission, noted the contradictory nature of some points of the draft and said that this draft law violates the equality of all union republics. The floor was then given to Deputy Prunskene, who said that this draft law had a difficult passage and that she was worried about the inequality between the center and the republics regarding material and technical supplies and other questions. She felt that the draft law had cut back the rights of the republics with regard, in particular, to the question of ownership.

"Deputy Sharin in his speech said that this draft law was premature and that you cannot build a house starting from the roof. During the discussion he was supported by Deputy Danilyuk who said that a law on property in the USSR and on the economic autonomy of all republics must be adopted first.

"During this acute discussion, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev commented on it like this: One must not go at it with hammer and tongs. I would like us to listen to each other. We are in favor of a strong and developing federation and we must together seek the optimal path of common interests. Then the discussion was continued.

"At the moment a deputy representing the Baltic republics is at the rostrum. Then there will be a short interval and afterward the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work."

Lithuanian Official Explains Walkout

LD2211132689 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Summary] The USSR people's deputies from Lithuania left the chamber in protest against the refusal to include the second reading of the draft law on the economic independence of the Baltic republics into the agenda of the USSR Supreme Soviet session.

Kazimiera Prunskiene, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic of Ministers, gave her opinion on the course of action of the delegation in a phone interview from Moscow.

[Begin Prunskiene recording] The further solution of the issue which concerns us has not been worsened by our walkout. The solution of the issue of our economic independence will become clear later. It is very important that the draft presented by the government was subjected to strong criticism; on many occasions deputies from the Ukraine, Georgia, and Russia, insisted that the draft variant presented by the Baltic republics be discussed, which they said was acceptable, logical and comprehensible. Of course, the obvious resistance by the administration and the chairman of the session, even on the issue of including our issue in the agenda, such persistent pushing of the government draft through to us, a draft which is hardly acceptable to anybody, did its work. [end recording]

Further, K. Prunskiene said that the deputies received a message from Lukyanov saying that the draft of the Baltic republics should now be urgently discussed in the commissions.

[Begin Prunskiene recording] I spoke to several members of the Commission for Economic Reform and they said that they did not think much work had to be carried out concerning this draft law because they were already familiar with it and they supported it. [end recording]

Following this, K. Prunskiene said that during the first reading of the draft law last July, out of 54 deputies who took part in the discussion, 50 deputies voted for the draft, 3 voted against and 1 abstained.

[Begin Prunskiene recording] If there are no special machinations, if the deputies at the session are not intimidated by our alleged wish to solve political problems through economic ones, if the deputies are not caught on this hook, I do not see why, during this period of several months, our deputies should feel differently then they did in July. Then they would have voted in our favor.

I would like to comment on a rather lengthy discussion between A. Brazauskas and Mikhail Sergeyevich which took place yesterday. I think that this issue being repeatedly stressed will on no account be a hindrance; on the contrary, this should help to demonstrate the righteousness of our demands, and if Comrade Gobrachev becomes involved in the proceedings of the session, I

would hope that the procedure then would be conducted more smoothly and more logically than when Rafik Nishanov was in the chair. [end recording]

Finally, K. Prunskiene said that they hoped to have another meeting with M. Gorbachev before the discussion of Baltic economic independence.

Declaration on Forcible Resettlement

PM2311151589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 First Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Declaration on Recognizing as Illegal and Criminal the Repressive Acts Against Peoples Subjected to Forcible Resettlement and on Ensuring their Rights"]

[Text] Today, in the period of Soviet society's revolutionary renewal, when the process of democratization and of the purging of all aspects of our life of deformations and distortions of the universal human principles of humanism has begun, there is an intensifying desire in the country to know the whole truth about the past in order to master its lessons for the sake of the future.

Memory returns us with a particular bitterness to the tragic years of Stalin's repressions. The lawlessness and tyranny did not bypass a single republic or a single people. The mass arrests and the torment of the camps, the hapless women, old men, and children in the resettlement zones continue to appeal to our conscience and to outrage our moral sense. That cannot be forgotten.

The expulsion of the Balkars, Ingush, Kalmyks, Karachai, Crimean Tatars, Germans, Meskhetian Turks, and Chechen from their homes during World War II represented barbaric actions of the Stalinist regime. The policy of forcible resettlement affected the fate of Koreans, Greeks, Kurds, and other people.

The USSR Supreme Soviet unreservedly condemns the practice of the forcible resettlement of whole groups of people as a very grave crime which contradicts the bases of international law and the humanist nature of the socialist system.

The USSR Supreme Soviet guarantees that the flouting of human rights and the norms of humanity at state level will never be repeated in our country.

The USSR Supreme Soviet believes it necessary to take the relevant legislative steps for the unconditional restoration of the rights of all Soviet peoples subjected to repressions.

The USSR Supreme Soviet, Moscow, Kremlin, 14 November 1989.

Political & Social

Politburo Discusses Results of Student Forum

PM2411102389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov Second Edition p 1

[Text] The results of the All-Union Student Forum which took place in Moscow were examined 23 November by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo at its routine sitting. It was noted that the forum has been an important social and political event in the country and in the life of young people. The main result of it was support by the overwhelming majority of delegates for the party's political course toward a comprehensive renewal of socialism, and the aspiration of the student fraternity to vigorously continue participation in the social and political life of the country and in the implementation of the national education reform.

However, the forum revealed the acute reaction of students and young people at school to unresolved social and economic problems, young people's dissatisfaction with restructuring of the system of education and upbringing, and the slowness in resolving many urgent and pressing issues of life.

It was deemed expedient to reflect the main principles of the party youth policy in contemporary conditions in the CPSU platform for the 28th CPSU Congress. The attention of local party bodies and of primary party organizations in learning establishments was drawn to the necessity of fundamental improving political work among the student fraternity.

It is necessary to conduct an open dialogue of party and local soviet leaders with students and pupils everywhere, to take their moods and proposals into consideration when decisions are made and to involve young people in constructive and creative work in order to intensify perestroyka. It was recommended that a discussion of the results of the forum's work be organized at an all-union seminar of secretaries from the party committees of higher educational establishments.

The Politburo considers it necessary to determine a set of immediate measures directed toward raising the standard of living, improving the material living conditions of students and pupils, and to make provision during the elaboration of the concept of the country's economic and social development for the 13th 5-year plan for measures to strengthen the material basis of higher and secondary special education, and the deepening of the educational reform.

Communist leaders of the USSR State Committee for Education and other ministries and departments which have higher and secondary special educational establishments are charged with considering, together with the Komsomol Central Committee and the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, delegates' proposals and critical remarks and the forum's documents, making

decisions on them, and where necessary tabling appropriate proposals to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the USSR Council of Ministers. The Central Committee Ideological Department is charged with tabling a proposal on the publication of an all-union student newspaper.

The results of the conference of leading party and local Soviet officials from autonomous republics, krays, and oblasts of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, which discussed progress in preparations for the elections to republican and local organs of authority, were examined at the session.

It was noted that it will be for the new body of deputies, elected from among competent and active representatives from various strata of the population, to tackle highly important tasks of implementing the second stage of the political reform and the restructuring of all spheres of the life in our society. The Politburo defined measures to implement the proposals and observations expressed by participants in the conference which was held.

A report was heard on the results of M.S. Gorbachev's conversation and A.I. Lukyanov's, Ye.M. Primakov's, and R.N. Nishanov's meetings with R. Suessmuth, president of the FRG Bundestag, and L. Fabius, chairman of the National Assembly of France. It was deemed useful to develop parliamentary contacts and to give them a more dynamic and politically full character, which corresponds to the realities of our times.

The Politburo examined the results of the conference of Central Committee secretaries of the CEMA countries' fraternal parties for economic questions in Prague, and approved the activity at it by the CPSU delegation headed by N.N. Slyunkov. It was noted that the exchange of opinions which took place on fundamental questions of socio-economic development and cooperation promoted the coordination of approaches adopted by the fraternal parties toward the development of cooperation withn the framework of the CEMA on the basis of democratic principles, pluralism of opinions, multiplicity of forms, and methods of cooperation.

The meeting heard a report from A.N. Girenko about the meeting between a delegation of the CPSU and Anguita, general secretary of the Communist Party of Spain, during its stay in Spain. It was stressed that the traditional ties of friendship and cooperation between the CPSU and the Communist Party of Spain were receiving new development and a creative nature on the basis of coincidence of views on topical international issues and commitment to the development of Soviet-Spanish relations.

CPSU Central Committee Meets 22 Nov

PM2211214189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A meeting was held at the CPSU Central Committee 22 November between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and union republic Communist Party Central Committee, kray party committee [kraykom], and oblast party committee [obkom] secretaries dealing with questions of the agroindustrial complex who are currently in Moscow attending qualification-enhancement courses at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences.

There was a frank and lively exchange of opinions on questions of present-day agrarian policy, the assimilation of new economic relations in the countryside, and the provision of cadre, organizational, and resource backup for the tasks of developing the country's food complex. V.M. Gubskiy, secretary of Rostov CPSU Obkom; A.S. Kamay, secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee; V.V. Zorin, secretary of Maritime CPSU Kraykom; I.G. Grinstov, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; G.A. Sivchenko, secretary of Altay CPSU Kraykom; Ye.B. Komarov, secretary of Murmansk CPSU Obkom; V.P. Brazhnik, secretary of Krasnodar CPSU Kraykom; V.F. Chernov, secretary of Dzhambul Kazakh Communist Party Obkom; and I.S. Silayev and P.I. Mostovoy, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers, expressed their views.

M.S. Gorbachev spoke in conclusion.

Taking part in the meeting were Ye.K. Ligachev, Ye.S. Stroyev, and G.I. Usmanov.

Gorbachev Addresses Secretaries

LD2211192189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1830 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Nov (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, today in the CPSU Central Committee met with secretaries of the Communist Parties Central Committees from the union republics, kray, and oblast party committees who are in charge of matters relating to the agroindustrial complex and who are currently in Moscow attending qualification-enhancement courses at the USSR Academy of Social Sciences under the CPSU Central Committee.

A frank and lively exchange of views took place concerning matters relating to modern agrarian policy, the assimilation of new economic relations in the countryside, and the staffing, organizational, and resource support for developing the country's food complex.

[In its report on Gorbachev's meeting with party officials at 1900 GMT on 22 November, Moscow Domestic Service adds the following information at this point: [The ideas were shared by (Gubskiy), secretary of the Rostov Oblast CPSU committee; Kamay, secretary of the Central Committee of the Belorussian communist party; Zorin, secretary of the Maritime Kray CPSU

committee; Grintsov, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; (Sivchenko), secretary of the Altay Kray CPSU committee; (Komarov), secretary of the Murmansk Oblast CPSU committee; (Brazhnik), secretary of the Krasnodar Oblast CPSU committee; Chernov, secretary of the Dzhambul Oblast committee of the Kazakhstan Communist Party; Silayev and Mostovoy, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers.

[In conclusion Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev made a speech. Taking part in the meeting were Comrades Ligachev, Stroyev, and Usmanov.]

Mikhail Gorbachev spoke in conclusion.

Prokofyev, Zaykov Hold News Conference 22 Nov

LD2211203689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] The latest news is on the air. Today a press conference was held at the Moscow City Party Committee. Over to our correspondent Vladimir Korablev.

[Korablev] This press conference—at which representatives of practically all the mass media and secretaries of the Moscow City CPSU Committee were present—was devoted to the results of the Moscow City Party Committee plenum that took place on 21 November. You already know from our reports that an organizational question was considered at the plenum: Comrade Zaykov was released from the duties of first secretary of the City Committee by the plenum in connection with his need to concentrate on his work at the CPSU Central Committee. In a secret ballot, Yuriy Anatolyevich Prokofyev was chosen for this post from 17 possible candidates; he previously worked as second secretary of the Moscow City Party Committee. Today, at a meeting with journalists, he said in particular:

[Begin Prokofyev recording] What are the basic tasks and problems to be solved? Well, all the processes taking place in the country are reflected in the city, as in a mirror, and taking into consideration the specific character of our city—a huge megalopolis—those problems in a number of cases are perhaps more sharply defined. The main thing now is the consolidation of all those forces in our city that are truly committed to perestroyka, that are concerned about perestroyka and that are striving for its realization. I understand the consolidation of forces not as the liquidation of democratization, not as an aspiration to force everyone into the same channel, and not as a striving to inculcate conformity in thinking in everyone. No; the question is to unite all those people who are struggling in real terms and from their positions for the renewal of socialism, for its development, and for the creation of such a socialist society that will both enhance its attractive strength in the eyes of our people and will prove the attractiveness of socialism in the world community. And we have an adequate number of those forces, though they may be attached to different platforms and may be solving those problems in different ways. However, I think that the main task is to consolidate the efforts of those positive forces which could implement perestroyka here in our city. [end recording]

[Korablev] Then Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, made a speech. He expressed his confidence that comrade Prokofyev, who has grown in unison with the city party organization, and who has sufficient experience of local soviet and party work, would cope successfully with the tasks placed on him. Foreseeing a question from the journalists on why he was entrusted with dealing with Defense Council matters, Comrade Zaykov said.

[Begin Zaykov recording] The point is that for 36 years—from the time I was a trainee metal worker to when I was general director of a scientific-production association—I worked at defense enterprises, and since 1985 I have been a member of the USSR Defense Council. The situation today is that constant attention is needed in the Defense Council. Conversion is under way. Spending on this country's defense is being cut. The armed forces are being reduced. Serious talks are taking place on the reduction and subsequently the complete destruction of nuclear weapons.

We must remain strong at a time when spending on defense and the strength of the armed forces have to be cut. An extra departmental approach is needed here. Under our constitution, the chairman of the Defense Council is chairman of the Supreme Soviet. You will be aware how busy Mikhail Sergeyevich is today. And a decision was adopted in the Politburo that there should be an assistant. This lot has fallen to me. In the role of secretary of the Central Committee and member of the Politburo, I shall be carrying out responsibilities for the Defense Council. [end recording]

Further on Prokofyev Remarks

PM2411103589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS correspondents B. Grishchenko, B. Shestakov report: "The Criterion Is Concrete Deeds"]

[Text] Moscow Communists' main concern is to enhance the actual returns from the perestroyka processes.

This was stressed in particular at a 22 November press conference at the Moscow CPSU City Committee [Gorkom] on the results of the Moscow Gorkom plenum held the day before.

"I do not intend to make any policy statements," with these words Yu.A. Prokofyev, who was elected Moscow Gorkom first secretary, opened his statement. "The course of the capital's party organization has been elaborated collectively. I had the opportunity to take part in this work, and all our plans which have proved their viability in practice will continue to be actively implemented by Moscow's Communists.

"Ahead of us lies a complex period—it is necessary to move on from the elaboration of the constructive perestroyka program to its implementation. I have accepted this difficult task because I have faith in the sense and powerful potential of the city's Communists, and I am hoping for all Muscovites' support, without which the solution of this task is simply impossible.

"In a multimillion-strong city the processes which are taking place in the country are reflected and sometimes thrown into sharper focus. The main thing now is the consolidation of all social forces committed to perestroyka and vitally interested in its success. It is not a question of uniting like-minded people, but of pooling the efforts of people who are striving in practice for the renewal of socialism."

The new leader of the capital's party organization described as key avenues in the coming period the switch of the city and its rayons to economic accountability relations, changes in investment policy, all-around development of local self-management, and a dynamic renewal of the style and methods of party work. Muscovites, he stressed, expect concrete, positive changes for the better.

"I am confident that the continuity of the Moscow Gorkom's strategic course will render good service to the capital's party organization and the city of Moscow," L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said. "It lies above all in the fact that through our efforts solid assets have been created, a good groundwork has been laid, and there is a precise course.

"Ways of implementing these programs and Moscow Communists' main spheres of action are also clearly defined. They are seeking to resolve this task on the basis of the territorial-sectoral principle."

Developing this thesis, the CPSU Central Committee secretary especially highlighted the need to grant rayons the maximum of rights. In this way, he emphasized, the course of the party toward the democratization of society and the idea of radical economic reform are implemented to the maximum, and the slogan "All power to the soviets!" is filled with content.

The situation in the country, in the party, and in Moscow at the current stage of perestroyka is not simple. However the Moscow CPSU Gorkom is a viable organ which has the organizational and intellectual potential, energy, and experience necessary to consolidate all healthy forces. This is the main thing.

Yu.A. Prokofyev and L.N. Zaykov answered journalists' questions.

Correction to Prokofyev Speech at Moscow Plenum

LD2211174589

The following correction pertains to the item subtitled "Further on New Party Chief," which appeared on pages 61-63 of the 22 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT.

Page 62, column two, second full paragraph should read: "TASS then reports on Prokofyev's speech, saying: 'The floor is given to Yu.A. Prokofyev. Having thanked the plenum participants for the high degree of trust placed in him, he said: I am very well aware at what complex and responsible juncture this trust has been placed in me.

"'You understand well what deep and contradictory feelings I am at the mercy of now. Naturally, as a human being, it is pleasant for me to hear kind words about myself. But I am also perfectly well aware of the enormous responsibility I have been given. All my adult life has been linked with Moscow. It is here that I joined the party and worked in various capacities. Whether in the rayon party committee, or in the Moscow Soviet Executive Committee, or in the CPSU City Committee, I have always endeavored to be myself, not to act against my conscience, to have and to defend my own position, and to be honest to the people and the party.

"'It is sincerely gratifying that in this hall, among the party and soviet aktiv, there are many people who think the way I do and that there is a good groundwork within the city party organization, as has been stated here by many people. It has to be said outright that large-scale and difficult work is ahead and that there will also be quite a few difficult days. But I would never have agreed to accept this post if I had not been confident of the intellect and strength of the Moscow Communist, and their ability to solve the most complicated tasks posed by perestroyka. "I am deeply convinced that the party will succeed in restructuring itself in accordance with what is demanded by the times and that the renewed party within the renewed society will succeed in implementing its vanguard role.

"'Now Muscovites expect tangible deeds from us—above all a stabilization of the city's socioeconomic situation. The transition to relations of financial autonomy, the strengthening of the independence of the rayon link, and the development of self-manangement principles will facilitate the solution of many problems.

"'It is also necessary to resolutely alter the investments policy. Given that there is a clear shortage of manpower, it is impermissible to create new jobs, save for those that are essential for the life and functioning of our huge city. This will make it possible to direct the potential thus released in order to solve urgent problems and to improve the ecological situation.

"'We will have to take an active part in the democratization of our society. We have embarked on a difficult political campaign and everyone is interested in having

honest, competent, and active people elected to the local authorities and to the soviets.

"'I see the consolidation of all the city's positive forces which sincerely support perestroyka as one of the most important tasks for the city party organization. Ahead is a most responsible stage of preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress. We must define our stand precisely and act in such a way that every day is a step forward, even if it is a small step forward.

"'This, then, is the main essence of our pre-congress work. My credo is to have decisions debated and made collectively, while responsibility for their implementation will be borne by us personally, each one at his post.'

"The report then..." (picking up paragraph three, providing fuller version of Prokofyev's remarks).

'Stormy' Debate Precedes Leningrad Joint Plenum

PM2211155789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Own correspondent Vladimir Nevelskiy report under the rubric "Direct Line": "Leningrad Communists' Program"]

[Text] A joint plenum of Leningrad CPSU Oblast and City Committees opened in the Smolnyy 21 November. Its participants are to adopt the Leningrad party organization's action program for deepening perestroyka under present-day conditions. Two versions of such a document were submitted for examination. One was adopted by a combined plenum in September and submitted for public discussion, and the other came into being during the discussion and collective finalization of the proposed program.

The elaboration of this program was prompted by the results of the spring elections to the country's supreme organ of power, when, as is known, the people of Leningrad denied the city's party and soviet leaders their trust and did not elect a single one of them as a USSR people's deputy.

This plenum has been preceded by heated and at times fierce arguments both at party meetings and in the pages of the local press. The Communists of Vasileostrovskiy and Kuybyshevskiy Rayons submitted their own draft programs for discussion. Taking the provisions of the original draft as their basis, several rayon party committees drew up their own versions.

The intensity of the passions may be judged from the appeal published in LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA by the party committee secretaries of nine leading associations. On behalf of the party committee secretaries council of the Association of Industrial Enterprises they declared, in particular, that it is necessary to point out in the future program: "The critical situation in the country on the eve of April 1985 largely came about because the party had admitted to the highest posts in the party and the state and handed over absolute power over the country, limited by no one, to people who brought both the party and the country to such a pass with the tacit consent of the party." And further: "We must give the people guarantees that that situation will not be repeated and that we oppose the concentration of power in anybody's hands, and in this connection...it should be emphasized that the party's chief aim in developing the political system is to realize the slogan 'All Power to the Soviets!' and the task of strengthening soviet power."

The stormy discussion of the draft lasted more than 2 months and enabled the commissions of the CPSU oblast and city committees to make several substantial amendments and additions to it. Thus, very important words have appeared in the new version of the draft which were not in the original document: "Leningrad Communists are resolutely breaking with Stalinism and the administrative-edict system engendered by it and will firmly uphold the democratic path of socialism's renewal."

It may boldly be stated that the attention of thousands upon thousands of Leningraders was focused on the thesis that "at present there are no objective preconditions for the need for Soviet society's political development along the path of a multiparty system." In the version submitted to the plenum this thesis now sounds differently: "Without denying political pluralism, including a multiparty system, as the principle of organizing the socialist political system, Leningrad Communists advocate a specifically historical approach to implementing it and the accelerated elaboration and adoption of a law on parties and public organizations."

The program being discussed at the plenum is, in point of fact, the Leningrad party organization's election platform. During the discussion which has begun Communists will also determine their attitude to the idea of production okrugs in local soviet elections. I will not undertake to forecast which viewpoint will prevail, I can only say how city folk regard the possibility of holding "experimental" elections. According to the data of a recent sociological poll, this idea is supported to one degree or another in Leningrad as a whole by just over one-fourth of voters (27 percent). More than half of the people of Leningrad (54 percent) oppose it.

Gidaspov To Head Gorkom

PM2211154589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the rubric "Leningrad Communists Plenum": "Search and Action Program"]

[Text] Leningrad, 21 Nov—The Communists of the city on the Neva and the oblast determined the strategy and tactics of their work in the immediate future when they voted today in the Smolnyy for the platform of the Leningrad party organization in present-day conditions. Its authors were not only the participants in the joint oblast and city party committee plenum, but also almost half a million Leningraders. For more than 2 months this

document was thoroughly analyzed, amended, and modified in labor collectives and primary party organizations and at meetings with the party aktiv and deputies.

How the opinion of the Communists and nonparty members was accumulated and how the main directions of collective progress were determined, was discussed in the report by B.V. Gidaspov, first secretary of the Leningrad oblast party committee [obkom]. As sociologists' research shows, the draft put forward for a referendum throughout Leningrad did not leave a single category of Leningraders indifferent.

Both the report and the speeches were sharp. Yes, the speakers noted, the huge economic difficulties are the reality of our times. Signs showing the party's loss of prestige among the masses have been correctly noted. Many levers for the running of society are not working. How can one argue with the idea that, having given a powerful impetus to the revolutionary transformations and formulated the general direction of their development, party committees at all levels have been left behind at the start line. The plenum participants talked with great concern about the growing influence of the shadow economy and deliberate attacks by various kinds of politicized informal associations on the principles of socialism and our ideology.

But no matter how complex the situation may be, the plenum emphasized, there is no alternative to perestroyka. The whole point is: Who wants to turn it, and in which direction.

The plenum urgently raised the question of strengthening party ranks, discipline among CPSU members, Communists' vanguard role in society, and the democratization of party life. The CPSU's leading role—and special attention was drawn to this—must not only be declared in laws and resolutions but must be affirmed by daily life, by the efforts of all who carry party membership cards. There was also a debate about how the party should continue its fight for influence over the masses taking into account the headlong development of new forms of people's activeness.

One of the main causes of the crisis phenomena in society is the fact that the correct tenets of scientific communism were interpreted dogmatically and its methodology was made the object of worship rather than of study.

Despite a broad range of opinions and different approaches toward the appraisal of the situation, plenum participants spoke of the need for the utmost strengthening of discipline, organization, and personal responsibility for the fulfillment of adopted decisions. This is especially important during the preparation for the new elections to soviets and when solving cadre policy problems.

Both the keynote speaker and the other speakers focused attention on vital questions concerning the economy, the transition to regional economic accountability and self-management, the solution of social problems, and the utilization and buildup of the scientific, intellectual and cultural potential of Leningrad City and Oblast. A demand was expressed to wage a more determined struggle against monopolism in the economy, to overcome "big is beautiful" mania, and at long last to make the working people masters of production.

While discussing their platform, Communists emphasized the need to improve the activity of Leningrad City and Oblast party committees, to advance the structural transformation of party organs, and to eliminate parallelism and duplication in their work. The multitier system fetters initiative and ultimately leads to reduced efficiency of party leadership. It was decided to combine the offices of first secretary of the oblast and city CPSU committees.

The plenum elected Leningrad Obkom First Secretary B.V. Gidaspov to also be first secretary and member of the Bureau of the Leningrad City CPSU Committee.

Plenum Adopts Action Program

LD2211174789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1520 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Leningrad, 22 November—From now on the party organizations of Communists of Leningrad [City] and the Leningrad Oblast will appear under a single leadership. Their joint plenum which ended here late yesterday evening adopted the unprecedented decision on the combination of the post of first secretary of the two committees of the party. Fifty-six-year-old Boris Gidaspov, a well-known scientist and production organizer and corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, has been elected the leader of almost 600,000 Communists. He entered party work about 4 months ago on the recommendation of Mikhail Gorbachev.

Leningrad Communists undertook such a step, the first in the structure of the CPSU, with the aims of consolidating efforts to deepen perestroyka and strengthen the role of the party in resolving the trenchant political and social tasks which are facing Soviet society. The Leningrad party organization, which underwent broadscale approbation of Communism at meetings, in discussions on the pages of the press, in television debates and in mass sociological surveys, put forward its position in the platform adopted at the plenum.

The Communists outlined active participation in the campaign which has begun on elections to local soviets as one of the most important thrusts of their activity in the nearest future. They have learned lessons from the defeat of their candidates at the elections of USSR People's Deputies in the spring of this year and now are offering to the electorate a weighed and realistic program for resolving a broad range of socioeconomic problems. At the plenum, the negative facts and phenomena giving rise to the justified dissatisfaction of the population were

analyzed and ways and methods of solving the difficult situation which has arisen were proposed.

The single party organization declared, moreover, that it was ready for constructive cooperation with all social movements on the platform of socialism. As for the elections procedure itself, the Communists proposed that the electorate themselves decide in what individual instance the proposal of candidates, as well as voting by territorial or alternative production districts—it is proposed to make major industrial enterprises the centers of such districts—are possible. Thus, supporters of the experiment think, the representation of workers, of whom, in their opinion, there are evidently not enough in the composition of the USSR Supreme Soviet, will be increased in the local soviets.

Rally Supports Party Platform

LD2311044789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Report by correspondent Vladimir Batalov; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A rally of the communists of the city took place in Leningrad today. They expressed support for the platform of the Leningrad party organization adopted at the plenum of the oblast and city party committees yesterday.

[Vladimir Batalov] The labor collectives of the leading enterprises of Leningrad, principally the communists, decided to hold this rally. It is necessary to look the truth in the eyes: The country is in a state of a sharply exacerbated crisis. The participants in the rally spoke about the urgent problems of perestroyka in the CPSU and the democratization of life within the party. Today, communists are not entitled to be passive observers of events, but must take responsibility for themselves and for everything which is going on in labor collectives and in the country. Time will not wait. History will not forgive placidity and inactivity. At the square—and representatives of the most varied organizations were there—calls were heard for unity of action and the consolidation of the progressive forces of society. This is necessary, for the sake of the future.

[S.V. Stepashin, teacher; identified by screen caption] This is probably the main thing today. Here, in this square, on Leningrad soil, I would like to say just one thing to the communists and all people: It is not Article 6 of the Constitution [dealing with leading role of the party], not resolutions and rallies, nor mutual accusations and quests for enemies, but unity and, most importantly, deeds—deeds, specifically—which must be the main thing in the activity of communists today. [video shows open-air rally, with banners, including "A new Central Committee for a renewed party" and "Party democratization—A new statute"; interviewee with correspondent]

Leningrad Party Chief Warns of Impending Chaos

AU2411101489 Paris AFP in English 0722 GMT 24 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, Nov 24 (AFP)—The Soviet Union is heading for chaos unless a worsening economic crisis is brought under control, according to Boris Gidaspov, head of the Soviet Communist Party in the Leningrad region.

The country needs "order so as not to slide towards chaos", he told Thursday's [23 November] edition of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, a newspaper published by the party central committee of the Russian federation.

Stressing "the state of crisis" and "a recent aggravation of the economic situation", Mr. Gidaspov told the paper that "badly conceived measures have made this crisis worse.

"There is a great deal of democracy and glasnost (openness) but no order or organisation. Democratisation must be carried out in an orderly fashion, otherwise there is slide towards chaos", he declared.

Mr. Gidaspov, party chief in the country's second city, also criticised the party for "keeping silent", which he said was "amoral" in the face of those who seek "people's capitalism, unlimited democracy and glasnost without a party".

He said however he was "against purges" and wanted those wishing to leave the party to do so of their own free will, a suggestion he described as "self-determination of communists".

Members currently have to seek permission to leave the party, and set out in writing their reasons for wanting to quit.

Mr. Gidaspov also rounded on Leningrad's Popular Front, an unofficial group of the city's reformers.

"Their programme has many similarities with the party's platform" he said, but its leaders were simply using the party "to conceal their true objective: the destruction of socialism".

Mr. Gidaspov was made regional chief by President Mikhail Gorbachev earlier this year, as part of a reorganisation in the wake of the party's poor showing against the Popular Front in legislative elections.

He was made the city's party leader on Tuesday "to eliminate pointless parallelisms", according to party daily PRAVDA.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA is seen as a conservative-leaning paper, a reputation it enhanced last year by publishing a letter seen at the time as a "conservatives' manifesto". The letter came from Leningrad sociologist Nina Andreyeva.

Shevardnadze Sees Politics, Ecology Unity

LD2211143189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1015 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow, 22 Nov (TASS)—A nuclear- and violence-free world will be simply impossible if we cannot ensure its ecological cleanness, Eduard Shevardnadze, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, writes in today's LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. According to the minister's words, only recently it, seemed that a huge distance separated diplomacy from ecology. Before the eyes of just one generation this distance has practically disappeared.

Today we know that the productive activity of man, in other words, industrialization, if carried out without looking back to the natural factors, creates forces and phenomena whose distructive potential could be comparable to the aftermath of the use of nuclear arms, the minister thinks.

If one makes a most approximate generalization, with continuation of today's tendencies threatens the inhabitants of our planet with poisoned air and drinking water, the worsening of the global climate, irreversible pollution of the world ocean, distruction of the ozone layer which protects the earth, the disappearance of forests, and the progressive encroachment of deserts.

The conclusion is self-evident: the picture of slow death of the human race from the influence of the negative ecological factors it created is no more attractive than a notion of what would happen to our planet in case of thermonuclear conflict. This means that the ecological frontier cuts across the very frontline of the struggle for human survival, together with disarmament, the solution of regional conflicts, and overcoming economic underdevelopment.

The author considers the theoretical, juridical, organizational, economic, financial, social, and other aspects of the problem in the article. "We can now justifiably speak about a union of politics and nature conservation as a single discipline—polit-ecology," Eduard Shevardnadze points out. The new political thinking and a line of action adequate to it in conditions of increasing world interdependence have accelerated the movement of these spheres together and have led to an understanding that the healing of the earth's ills requires adoption of urgent worldwide decisions on the highest political level and a genuine internationalization of states' efforts."

"Diplomacy is an inalienable part of a state's political activity and, consequently, it forms an organic part of the polit-ecological complex as one of its weighty components. Polit-ecology finds practical expression in international affairs in the concept of ecological security as one of the ingredients of comprehensive security. We understand ecological security as being a condition in relations among states which guarantees the preservation, rational use, reproduction, and enhancement of the quality of the environment in the interests of the stable and secure development of all states and the creation of favorable conditions for the life of each human being. Ecological security presupposes the implementation of a system of normative, organizational, and economic production measures adopted within the framework of wide-ranging international cooperation and on the basis of international law."

The conference on the environment and development to be convened in 1992, the concept of which is being elaborated by the current session of the UN General Assembly, will be a landmark in international cooperation in nature conservation. The USSR has, of course, proposed that it be held at the level of heads of state and government. The conference requires the most careful and comprehensive preparation, for which not much time remains. This task is all the more crucial for Soviet diplomacy.

Continuing Vorkuta Strike Situation Reported

PM2211163189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 Second Edition p 6

[Dispatch by correspondent G. Sazonov: "Not Losing Dignity"]

[Text] Vorkuta—The city beyond the Arctic circle is living through alarming days. People of different professions are waiting to see when the miners will end their strike completely. Its "radius" has affected many people.

A few days ago I visited the railroad workers' collectives, with a total of about 15,000 men. At the Vorkuta locomotive depot it is not the teams' fault that they are standing idle. And this depot is not alone in this department. The disruption of the rhythm has swept the entire northern railroad as far as Yaroslavl. It has had tangible influence on the financial situation and is compelling the railroad workers to make amendments to their programs.

"We will obviously have to cut back on the social development funds," E. Skoblikov, deputy chief of the Vorkuta department, says with sorrow. "That means primarily the construction of housing by the direct labor method at the stations, and we have 65 of them, including in Labytnangi City, Tyumen Oblast. Many workers are living in poor apartment blocks. Yet we have always been a profitable department."

The miners of the basin's biggest mine—the "Vorgashorskaya"—are continuing to strike, demanding specific documents from the government. In fact the people at this enterprise have become the hostages of the strike leaders, who do not want to consider anything. The situation in the collective is heated to the utmost. Passions are being heated by all kinds of envoys who are attracted here like flies to the jam pot. A representative of the Latvian People's Front spoke recently. Yesterday Gusev, deputy chairman of the "Lenteploenergo" union

of labor collectives came up with a speech, presenting himself as a member of...Poland's "Solidarity." Crude attacks on the party and government and their leaders, calls for the destabilization of the economy—that is how they are drawing applause. The strike at this coal enterprise long since ceased to be economic, it has developed into political confrontation. Unfortunately, the envoys' propagandist frenzy is failing to meet with a due rebuff among the mine workers. It is true that city party committee first secretary V. Serdyukov held a long meeting here recently, not the only meeting, of course.

"Many of the miners' complaints against us are unfounded and are based on distorted information," he said. "For instance, they asked why the city party committee has sequestered the city strike committee's bank account. No one has sequestered it, especially not us. The thrust is as follows. The city soviet executive committee issued a resolution on repealing its former decision on the approval of the strike committee statute and the strike committee lost its power as a corporate body and consequently its bank account. On the other hand, we suggested to the territorial committee of the trade union that it help the strike committee in opening a new account, which was done. Such examples are no rarity. Rumors, imprecise information, and all kinds of stories merely impede mutual understanding."

And this understanding is particularly necessary now. I frequently heard workers at the mines say they were tired of the strike. Yes, tired. So they must, without losing dignity, emerge from the complex situation. I recall that commitments were made not only by the government to the miners but also by the miners to the government. The main one is to repay the debt incurred since the July strike and not to further reduce volumes of coal extraction. But this has not been fulfilled. The result is still a "game with one goal."

"We are moving to self financing. This is a complex process and at the start of the year we had a deficit for the purchase of mining equipment somewhere in the region of R26 million," noted A. Tsurupa, director for economics at the "Vorkutaugol" Association. "We halved the deficit using internal reserves. We hoped to create a financial reserve. But now, in connection with the strike, there is no question of it. Moreover, we are sliding into debt. Equipment is arriving and there is nothing with which to pay for it. We are eating into the remains of the material incentive fund. The losses from the strike have passed the R20 million mark, including fines from consumers, because we have after all disrupted deliveries. Some R12 million in wages has been lost: There is no coal extraction."

Every hour the mines stand idle means hundreds of thousands of rubles lost. And later they will primarily affect the miners and their families. The simple economic truth is becoming increasingly obvious to many people.

Vorgashorskiy Mine Still on Strike

LD2211204489 Moscow TASS in English 2005 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Vorkuta (Komi ASSR) November 22 TASS—The Vorgashorskiy Mine, the largest in the Pechora coal-mining basin, was still on strike today, while all the other mines were operating.

Representatives of the Vorkuta miners, who took part in a November 17 meeting with Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov which examined the fulfilment of government resolution No. 608, tonight met a group of miners from the Yur-Shor Mine who went on a hunger strike and briefed them on the results and the decisions of the meeting. The hunger strike was stopped in the morning today.

The Bureau of the Vorkuta Communist Party Committee condemned communists' participation in the illegal strike and urged them to resume work. The bureau demanded that primary party organisations and managers, who are members of the Communist Party, carry out consistent actions in fulfilling the labour dispute law, normalise the situation at the mines.

The majority of Vorkuta miners believe that continuing the strike will lead into an impasse and that socio-economic problems should be tackled without invoking emergency measures.

However, the strike committee of the Vorgashorsky mine puts forward a number of demands, including political ones. The mine party committee took a resolution saying that the strike suspension is possible only if an authoritative government commission arrives in Vorkuta to deal with the miners' problems on the spot and brings a relevant resolution on the non-use of sanctions against the organisers and participants in the current strike.

So far, all arguments that the strikers go along the road which leads up a blind ally are given a hostile reception at the mine.

Over the past twenty four hours the Vorkutaugol Association has increased production and shipment of coal. However target figures have not been met. Shipment of coal, mainly coking coal, was nearly 770,000 tonnes behind plan this month.

Coal Output Increases

LD2311231889 Moscow TASS in English 1936 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Vorkuta, Komi Autonomous Republic November 23 TASS—Out of 13 mines in Vorkuta, only the Vorgashor Mine remains on strike, TASS learnt at the Vorkutaugol amalgamation.

Coal output at Vorkuta mines has increased considerably. Over 500 carloads of coal were shipped out of Vorkuta in the past day.

One of the main demands of the striking miners, which is also supported by many miners who resumed work, is the abrogation of the decision of the Supreme Court of the Komi Autonomous Republic, according to which the present strike is illegal.

As was reported, the Supreme Court of the Komi Autonomous Republic on October 27 settled the lawsuits of the administrations from the three Vorkuta mines by recognising the strikes as illegal.

Lawsuits from the administrations of other striking enterprises have not yet reached the court by them.

The Supreme Court of the Russian Federation endorsed the lower court decision. From November 16 to 20 the Supreme Court of the Komi Autonomous Republic discussed and settled lawsuits brought by the managers of eight more mines in Vorkuta by recognising the strikes at these mines as illegal.

Pit Strike Update

PM2411124989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 24 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "'Vorgashorskaya' Continues Strike"]

[Text] Vorkuta, Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]—Of Vorkuta's 13 coal-mining enterprises, only 1 mine—"Vorgashorskaya"—continued the strike yesterday. The other "Vorkutaugol" Association mines in the polar city, TASS correspondent V. Makarov was told, are operating. That is why the stream of fuel extracted by the Vorkuta miners has increased substantially. In the last 24 hours they have sent consumers more than 500 freightcars of coal.

But the fuel extraction and shipment targets have once again remained unfulfilled. For instance, the collectives at five mines alone have coped with the daily coal extraction plans. The rest have not as yet attained the necessary tempo. That is why the "Vorkutaugol" Association's shortfalls are increasing. Since the beginning of November they total more than 740,000 tonnes and approximately 784,00 tonnes respectively for coal extraction and shipments to consumers.

Today one of the striking miners' main demands, which is also supported by many miners who have resumed work, is that the Komi ASSR Supreme Court decision to deem the current strike illegal be rescinded. Following appeals by the administrations of three Vorkuta mines, the Komi ASSR Supreme Court deemed the strikes there illegal. The court did not receive appeals from administrations of other striking mines. The Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic left this decision unchanged. But 16-20 November the Komi SSR Supreme Court examined and satisfied appeals from another eight Vorkuta mines for the strikes there to be deemed illegal. The following detail must be clarified in particular. V. Khinkin, chairman of the Komi ASSR Supreme Court, announced that questions of compensation for the damage done by the strike and fines were not considered at these sittings.

The Vorkuta miners also voiced a demand regarding the need for a body to control the workers' movement in the city. Its functions were performed by the city workers (strike) committee. V. Koksharov, first deputy chairman of the Vorkuta City Soviet Executive Committee [Gorispolkom], told a TASS correspondent that the gorispolkom received an application 22 November asking for the "city workers committee to be registered as a public body." However, all the requisite documents for the examination of this application are not as yet available.

W. Ukrainian Miners Oust Trade Union Committees

LD2311085589 Moscow TASS in English 0737 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Lvov November 23 TASS—By TASS correspondent Miron Pavlyust:

Miners in Western Ukraine have ousted trade union officials who they said were mere apparatchiks oblivious to miners' real needs.

Workers at the Ukrzapadugol Mining Amalgamation recently held a second trade union re-election meeting advancing their choices of people to fill top trade union posts in the area.

In summer, they downed tools demanding that local trade unions be purged of official stooges.

To much surprise, at the first conference the administration proposed to leave the same people in the regional trade union committee. The delegates walked out in protest. An initiative group was set up to deal with the crisis. It recommended that grassroots trade union organisations nominate their candidates to the territorial committee.

Workers Sergey Besaga and Mikhail Makhnik swept the board at the second conference, winning delegates with clear and realistic programmes. Besaga was elected chairman and Makhnik secretary of the new territorial committee.

"It is very easy to promise manna from the sky to miners. But this is a dead-end policy," Besaga said.

"We aim to do everything possible today and will not postpone the solution of other important issues. We have first focused on social aspects. Underground drifters now have longer holidays, rates for night shifts have been increased and a day off for all has been introduced."

"We are now battling against occupational diseases and working to help provide miners with decent food and help women employees," he said.

Situation in NKAO, U.S. Resolution Reported

NC2211193089 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] For the last few days more freight shipments have come into the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. Railcars carrying agricultural machinery, prestressed concrete materials, rolls of metals, equipment, petroleum products, foodstuffs, manufactured goods, and feeds are continuing to arrive at the Stepanakert railway station.

Yesterday, on 20 November, 18 cars were unloaded; 88 are waiting to be unloaded. The pace is slow at present.

However, it is illogical to claim that the blockade of NKAO has been lifted. Road transportation remains blocked. The Special Administration Committee of the NKAO in cooperation with the commandant of the Special District is taking measures to ensure the safe passage of car convoys from Armenia to NKAO via Kazakh. The NKAO authorities have ensured the passage such a car convoy through that sector of the Mir Bashir-Kelbachar road which passes through the Martakert rayon of NKAO.

The security situation in the oblast remains tense. Unfortunately there are still lawless acts. For example, an explosive device was used on the morning of 20 November on the road connecting Stepanakert's Kirkirchan suburb with Shushi. No one was injured. There were no serious violations of law on interethnic grounds yesterday.

The Armenian population of Artsakh [NKAO] is seriously concerned that the debate on NKAO problem is being unjustly delayed at the USSR Supreme Soviet; this is the main reason that tension persists.

The majority of the Karabakh people expresses its disagreement with the latest statement of the USSR Foreign Ministry on the draft resolution on NKAO problem endorsed by the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Karabakh people in particular believe that the strong reaction shown by the Soviet citizens against the resolution of the committee cannot be justified. Yet the USSR Foreign Ministry statement conveys such a reaction even though it is not familiar with the text of the draft resolution of the U.S. Senate.

Armenians Reject Condemnation of U.S. Resolution

NC2211184789 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 22 Nov 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] Under the title "Sound Judgment" [word indistinct], the paper published a series of items on page three about the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee's discussion of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] problem. A USSR Foreign Ministry statement, [words indistinct], said that on 19 November Bessmertnykh, first deputy foreign minister of USSR, called U.S. Ambassador Matlock, and handed him a note concerning the draft resolution endorsed by the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

On the same day, the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs discussed the issue of the draft resolution of Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Members of the committee, Burlatskiy, Borovik, Ambartsumyan, and others spoke at the meeting. Deputies from Armenia and NKAO Arutyunyan, Balayan, Pogosyan, and Grigoryan expressed their stance on the issue. They specifically criticized the draft statement of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs and demanded that before issuing such statements, the full text of the draft resolution of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee must be published.

The Armenian and NKAO delagates submitted a statement to the Presidium of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The paper has published that statement, the text of the draft resolution of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as well as the statement of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs.

The paper has also published the text of the cable of the NKAO National Council to the U.S. Senate; the protest issued at the meeting of the representatives of the work collectives in Yerevan's 26 commissars rayon and party organizations; the statement by Tovmasyan, deputy chairman of the NKAO National Council and a member of the NKAO Special Administration Committee; and an article by the political commentator Agopyan.

In its cable the National Council expresses gratitude for the concern shown by the Senate for the fate of the blockaded Armenian population of the oblast.

The paper also informed the readers that late at night when the paper was ready for printing, it became known that the U.S. Senate has confirmed the draft resolution of the Foreign Relations Committee on NKAO problem.

Deputies Issue Declaration

NC2411102489 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 22 Nov 89

[From the review of the republic's press]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The Armenian and Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] delegates to the USSR Supreme Soviet submitted the following declaration to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet: Proceeding from the concept of the relativity of interference in the internal affairs of other countries and national self-determination, the Soviet Union, from its beginning until now, has fervently protected the peoples' demands for self-determination, rejecting any accusation of interference in the internal affairs of others. If we follow the logic of the protest issued by the USSR Foreign Ministry, then it must be stated that the Soviet Union was interfering in the

internal affairs of other states all along. As to the documentation of this affair, we would like to mention that, thus far, the reply to the legal demands of the NKAO for self-determination have been the Sumgait genocide, the massacre of Armenians in other settlements of Azerbaijan, the blockade of Armenia, the 1 1/2-year siege of the NKAO and the constant threats hidden in warnings of unpredictable consequences.

The USSR Foreign Ministry statement engendered a huge wave of indignation in our republic as well. The participants in the meeting of the representatives of the work collectives and party organizations of Yerevan's 26-commissars rayon cabled Eduard Shevardnadze, Soviet minister of foreign affairs, saying in particular: The statement in question has been adopted without the publication of the text of the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee resolution, and it lacks the political, legal, and moral basis to impose personal interpretations on the public. Such interpretations are a flagrant violation of the interests of the Armenian people, and aim to further exacerbate the tension in the region and create conditions for the delay of a just and political solution of the NKAO problem.

Vladimir Tovmasyan, deputy chairman of the NKAO National Council, writes in KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN: It appears that after selling out Armenian territories to Turkey and Azerbaijan in 1921, the times still have not changed and the central authorities continue to negotiate on our behalf, give their consent, or express their indignation. He adds that it is becoming clear that the so-called new thinking concept works for the interests of only one side.

The NKAO National Council and all the Armenians of the NKAO are indignant, not against the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee resolution, but against the USSR Foreign Ministry statement; against its inappropriate stance which tramples upon the rights and demands of the Armenian population and which distorts the facts. There is an unequivocal consensus that this is a continuing manifestation of the anti-Armenian policy.

Mkrtchyan Criticizes Soviet Reaction

NC2311103089 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The Armenian Republic's foreign affairs minister, Anatoliy Mkrtchyan, has expressed his misgivings about the statement issued by the USSR Foreign Ministry concerning the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee's resolution on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] problem.

Interviewed by a correspondent for KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN, Mkrtchyan said: It is unsettling to confess that I, like you, learned of the USSR Foreign Ministry's statement from the television and the press. Not only did they not consult with the Armenian Foreign Ministry, but they also did not inform it about the draft resolution endorsed by the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee. After a proper analysis of the USSR Foreign Ministry's protest, we have concluded that such actions infringe upon the statements to the effect that the sovereign rights of the republics would be broadened in international affairs and thus it engenders justified distrust among the people of the republic. This proves that the restructuring in the foreign policy departments is not an easy process and its progress is often impeded by the old thinking. We immediately informed the USSR Foreign Ministry leadership of our position, Anatoliy Mkrtchyan concluded.

As you probably know dear compatriots, the U.S. Senate has already approved the draft resolution of the Foreign Relations Committee on the NKAO problem. We were informed about this by the Armenian deputies taking part in the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in Moscow.

Armenian Rally Condemns Reaction

NC2411104889 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1630 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] A mass rally took place in Edzhmiatsin yesterday. It strongly condemned the USSR Foreign Ministry statement made in response to the U.S. Senate resolution on the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO].

Norayr Yegiazaryan, first secretary of the Edzhmiatsin rayon party committee, addressed the rally and informed the gathering about the USSR Foreign Ministry statement and then pointed out that the Armenian people again are suffering immense distress, their souls are troubled. The reasons for this are the fabricated facts and reconciliatory intents of the statement, and the new actions of the old bureaucratic machine.

The speakers condemned the statement and proposed to draw up a protest cable. The cable says in particular: The protest statement does not emanate from the needs of the restructuring and does not really express the opinion of the country's people. This is a part of the policy of hiding the truth from the people in which things are confirmed and statements are made on behalf of the people without publishing the facts. The aforesaid statement is drawn up intentionally and aims to create a false impression for the USSR people's deputies who are preparing to debate the NKAO problem.

Lizichev Visits Armenia, Meets Reporters

NC2311114389 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 23 Nov 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] According to ARMENPRES, a meeting took place on 22 November at the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee between Lizichev, Army general, head of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, and USSR people's deputy, and the directors of the republic's newspapers, magazines, and

ARMENPRES as well as correspondents from the central newspapers and television. Lizichev spoke about the servicemen's contribution in the Armenian earthquake zone and about restructuring in the Soviet Armed Forces. He pointed out that the USSR Defense Ministry has decided this year to allow 24 percent of army draftees from Armenia to serve in their own republic, primarily so that they can undertake construction work in the disaster zone.

Army Gen Lizichev highly assessed the Armenian people's role in the restructuring of the Armed Forces and their contribution to the Soviet people's victory during the Great Patriotic War. He then answered reporters' questions.

Armenian Party Discusses 1990 Draft Economic Plan

NC2311235389 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1715 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] The Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has discussed the draft state plan and state budget of the republic for economic and social development in 1990 prepared by the republic's Council of Ministers.

It was indicated that some work has been done toward the solution of the complex social and economic problems facing the republic in an effort to implement the principles adopted at the September 1988 and July 1989 plenums of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee. Attempts have been made to check the negative trends, to mobilize internal reserves and potentials, and to introduce balance in planning in order to stabilize the situation.

Despite that, in the drafts for the next year insufficient account has been taken of the urgency of creating conditions for the revival of the economy, the surmounting of inertia in social development, and the stable and productive operation of all the links in the national economy. The draft of the plan has been drawn up from a traditional standpoint. It lacks a purposeful approach to the solution of important economic problems; it has failed to grasp the acuteness of the prevailing situation and the extraordinary nature of the measures being taken to extricate the economy from the crisis. It was sharply pointed out that the draft plan has not clearly conveyed a program for the elimination of the consequences of the earthquake and the construction and reinforcement of houses , and has not indicated how purposefully to use the entire potential of the republic to achieve these aims.

Considering the social reorientation of the national economic development of the republic as the axis of the entire social-economic policy, the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau instructed the State Planning Organization, [passage indistinct] ministries, departments, enterprises, and organizations radically to alter their attitudes toward the social needs and requirements of the people, and substantially to bolster this [words indistinct].

The detailed (?report on the meeting) in the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau will be published in the press.

Azerbaijan To Publish Draft Constitutional Bills

NC2411112089 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 22 Nov 89

[From the republican press review]

[Text] A report published on the front pages of today's newspapers under the heading "At the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Presidium" notes that in accordance with a decision adopted by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium has decided to publish the draft bills on the changes and additions to be made to the Azerbaijan SSR's Constitution and the regulations for the election of people's deputies to the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet and local soviets in the republic's press organs for the purpose of submitting them to popular debate in November 1989.

The Committee on Legislative Considerations was directed to consider the suggestions and [word indistinct] that will emerge during the popular debate on the bills and submit the appropriate recommendations.

Meanwhile, the Nakhichevan Autonomous Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium and rayon and city people's deputies soviet executive committees were instructed to organize the work required to disseminate the suggestions put forward by the people's deputies, citizens, work collectives, social organizations, and mass media organs in connection with the draft bills.

Officials Decry 'Azerbaijanization' of NKAO

NC1611153289 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 16 Nov 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] Maksim Mirzoyan, chairman of the Stepanakert City Soviet Executive Committee; (Andranik Aghazaryan), acting chairman of the Askeran Rayon Soviet Executive Committee, and a number of officials signed an open letter to the USSR Supreme Soviet and to the Special Administration Committee of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. The letter stated that lately the leadership of the Azerbaijan Republic, having failed to subjugate the national liberation struggle of the native Armenian population, has chosen the course of Azerbaijanization of the NKAO.

The aim of this comprehensive plan is to alter artificially the demographic balance in favor of the Azerbaijani population in order to gain a clear supremacy [words indistinct]. This would put an end to the NKAO problem, the essence of which is the self-determination of the Artsakh [NKAO] people. [words indistinct]

Ryzhkov Cited on Quake Zone Restoration

NC1911101889 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 19 Nov 89

[Text] As has already been reported, Nikolay Ryzhkov, member of the of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, replied to questions put to him at the all-union students conference on 15 November. One of the delegates reminded him of the statement he made soon after the Armenian earthquake to the effect that the disaster zone would be restored within 2 years. He was asked if this was possible to achieve.

Ryzhkov replied: Yes, based on our assessments soon after the earthquake we envisaged a plan to restore that region within 2 years. The government drew up its plans on the basis of that assessment. What is the present situation? We are lagging behind. I think that we will not be able to accomplish the task within 2 years. We will probably have to allow another year. There are two reasons for this. First, we had not taken into account the (slowing down of construction work in Armenia) as a result of growing demands for anti-seismic measures. The drafts have been altered and [words indistinct]. The second reason is the instability in Transcaucasia. Before the transport blockade, nearly 50,000 builders from all the republics were working in the earthquake zone and were building houses and other projects. When the trains carrying construction materials could not arrive at their destination, some of these building workers left. Now our task is to restore the work rhythm and, with the assistance of the entire country, to achieve what we promised the Armenian people.

Correction to 'Azerbaijan Upgrades Relations'

NC2111134289

The following correction pertains to the item entitled "Azerbaijan Upgrades Relations With Allied Republics," which was published on page 72 of the 15 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT.

Page 72, column one, paragraph one, first sentence should read: "...Council of Ministers in union [muttefik] republics and their..." (rewording, supplying vernacular);

Same paragraph, sentence two should read: "...visited the fraternal, union [muttefik], and autonomous republics. During..." (rewording, supplying vernacular).

Moldavian Supreme Soviet Session Agenda Viewed

PM2311125989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent A. Pasechnik report: "Session Opens"]

[Text] Kishinev, 21 Nov—The 14th session of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, began its work here today. Deputies will discuss and adopt republican laws "On Amendments and Additions to the Moldavian SSR Constitution (Fundamental Law)," "On Elections of Moldavian SSR People's Deputies," and "On Elections of Deputies to Moldavian SSR Local Soviets of People's Deputies." The session will also set the date for the upcoming elections and form a Central Electoral Commission.

The session agenda also includes questions on the State Plan for the Moldavian SSR's Economic and Social Development in 1990, on the progress of this year's plan fulfillment, the republic's budget for next year, and the budget's implementation in 1988.

Bearing in mind the recent well known events in Moldavia, it is important to note that the session has begun in a sociopolitical atmosphere which is already much calmer. Its relative stabilization has been promoted to a large extent by the broad explanatory and propaganda work being done among labor collectives and in places of residence by party and soviet organs and aktiv members, as well as by the effective actions of law enforcement organs. There has been a noticeable improvement in the availability of information to the population in the past few days.

There was a positive response in the republic to a 2-hour dialogue between television viewers and P.K. Luchinskiy, first secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, last Sunday [19 November].

Supreme Soviet Discusses Elections

LD2311143189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] The Supreme Soviet of the Moladvian Soviet Socialist Repuiblic [SSR] is continuing its work in Kishinev. Debates are in progress on each article of the draft laws about changes in the Moldavian Constitution, about elections to the republican Supreme Soviet and to local soviets. The articles already approved mention that the model of the new organizational structure of the supreme power in Moldavia does not envisage the convocation of a Congress of Peoples' Deputies. It has been decided to dispense with the preelection meetings in the constituencies and elections of the people's deputies directly from the public organizations.

The number of the candidate deputies is not limited in elections. The new law on elections of the Moldavian SSR determines that every citizen of the republic has the right to vote, regardless of origin, residential qualification, social standing and property qualification, race and nationality, language and religion, education, and nature of employment.

Debate on Ratifying Prosecutor

PM2311131989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "At the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Text] Kishinev, 22 Nov—The Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session continued its work here today. The main topic on the 2d day of the session was the discussion of the Law on Amendments and Addenda to the Moldavian SSR Constitution and the Laws on Elections of Moldavian People's Deputies and Local Soviets.

The ratification of one of the articles of the law on questions relating to the sole jurisdiction of the republic's Supreme Soviet was a stumbling block for the participants. A number of deputies insisted on adopting an item in contravention of the USSR Constitution saying that the appointment of the Moldavian SSR prosecutor must be ratified by the republic's Supreme Soviet. After a long debate, which sometimes overstepped the bounds of parliamentary ethics, the session decided to appeal to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies by way of a legislative initiative proposing that a republic's prosecutor be ratified by its Supreme Soviet following his appointment by the USSR prosecutor general.

The session will continue its work tomorrow.

Estonia Keeps Residence Requirement for Candidates

PM2311142789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[ETA-TASS report under the general heading: "At Plenums and Sessions"]

[Text] Tallinn—The Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session continued here today. The main question on the agenda at the eighth sitting of the session was the discussion on the third reading and adoption of the Estonian SSR Law on Elections to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet. The "Equal Rights" group of deputies, which disagrees with the residence qualification proposed in the draft law, demanded the third reading of the draft law last time.

The consultative committee under the republic's Supreme Soviet Presidium comprising representatives of various social movements operating in Estonia met the day before the session's sitting. The opinion prevailed here that the residence qualification should be retained in the draft law. The draft law was submitted for the third reading in this form with a number of amendments.

This time the debate mainly revolved around the draft law's provision that a candidate deputy must without fail live or work on the territory of the electoral okrug in question. The supporters of this restriction based their stance on the fear that otherwise the central authorities in Tallinn may step up their pressure on the rayons. They were in the majority and this provision was enshrined in the draft law. Then the draft law as a whole was put to the vote and was adopted by 186 votes. Expressing their disagreement with the draft law and making an appropriate statement, some deputies from the "Equal Rights" group—approximately 40 people—abstained from voting.

The adopted Law on Elections to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet provides that citizens who have reached the age of 21 years and who have lived in Estonia for at least 10 years can stand for election to the republic's parliament. There is no residence qualification for voters.

The day began somewhat unusually for deputies—they spent an hour learning how to use the electronic "voting machine" which has been installed in the Supreme Soviet conference hall. It can not only count the votes during secret ballots, shows of hands, and voting by name, but also line up deputies to speak, automatically switch off the microphones at each deputy's seat when their time is up, and many other things.

Estonian Parliament Debate on 1940 Events Detailed

PM2111095789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 89 Morning Edition p2

[Own correspondent L. Levitskiy report under the rubric "Sessions of the Union Republics' Supreme Soviets": "The Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic"]

[Text] More rallies in Tallinn. Yesterday they were held at the "RET" Association and the "Dvigatel," "Baltic Ship Repair Plant," and Pegelman plants. Railroad workers are continuing their rallies today. Their participants approve of the actions of the deputies' group "For Equal Rights" at the Estonian Supreme Soviet session on 12 November....

So, what actually happened at the session? Deputies discussed the draft resolution "On a Historical-Legal Assessment of the Events in Estonia in 1940" prepared by the standing commissions. Keynote speaker Kh. Eyler briefly formulated the assessment as follows: The Soviet Union occupied Estonia.

Deputy V. Malkovskiy strongly disagreed with the speaker. He pointed to the tendentious selection of documents and the mistakes and inaccuracies in them.

People at the session urged that the resolution not be adopted in haste, because, on instructions from USSR people's deputies, a special commission has prepared findings on the treaty between the Soviet Union and Germany in 1939.

The deputies' opposition developed into open conflict. P. Panfilov, chairman of the group "For Equal Rights," announced that, considering the possible harmful consequences of a hastily adopted decision for the peoples' future and the country's restructuring process, we refuse to participate further in the work of the session. And 56 deputies left the hall. The vote went ahead without them. The resolution "On a Historical-Legal Assessment of the

Events in Estonia in 1940" was approved by 188 votes. One deputy voted against the resolution and four abstained.

The resolution contains three points.

"1. To consider the decision of the State Duma on 21 July 1940—the declaration on the incorporation of Estonia into the USSR—null and void, because it is not based on the free expression of the people's will.

"2. To petition for the restoration of Estonia as a subject of international law, for which purpose the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet retains the right to organize talks on relations between sovereign states within the union and in the international community. In this respect the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet is guided by the universally recognized inalienable right of nations to self-determination.

"3. To instruct the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to review the normative acts issued in the summer of 1940 by the president of the Estonian Republic and the government of the Estonian Republic formed on 21 June 1940 under pressure from representatives of the Stalinist regime and to submit the appropriate conclusions for confirmation by the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet.

"The adoption of this resolution is not interpreted as application of Article 69 of the Estonian SSR Constitution."

In other words, as it was explained to me, the resolution is not a statement or declaration on secession from the Soviet Union....

The Supreme Soviet session and its decision have sharply increased the tension in the republic. I would just like to remind you of one thing. There are never any victors in interethnic conflicts.

Estonian Parliament Hears Proposal on Article 6

PM1611144589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Nov 89 Second Edition p 3

[ETA-TASS report: "Trenchant Debate"]

[Text] Tallinn, 13 Nov—Last Sunday the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet session continued its work here.

The session examined the proposal from the deputies' group for questions of democratic development regarding Article 6 of the union republic's constitution, which defines the Estonian Communist Party's role and place in the republic's political structure. The deputies decided to submit this proposal for consideration by the commission which is elaborating a new Estonian SSR Constitution and improving constitutional legislation.

The session will continue its work 17 November. The third reading of the Law on Elections to the Estonian SSR Supreme Soviet will also take place then.

Lithuania Adopts Ethnic Minorities Law

LD2411032489 Moscow TASS in English 2114 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Vilnius November 24 TASS—By TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila:

"Lithuania is the first among the Soviet republics where the solution of ethnic problems is tackled on state and legal, not on ideological, planes," said Galina Kobeckaite, chairperson of the committee for Ethnic [words indistinct] (formed) at the Lithuanian Council of Ministers several weeks ago.

She said this to appraise the fact that the session of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, which opened here on Thursday, adopted Lithuania's law on ethnic minorities.

The new law has the purpose to ease tension which formed in the republic after the Lithuanian language had become official language.

The law stipulates that the republic guarantees to all citizens regardless of their nationality equal political, economic and social rights and freedoms.

Poles, Russians, Jews, Tatars, people of other ethnic groups residing in Lithuania for long will have an opportunity to study in their native language. For this purpose pre-school institutions and general educational schools are formed.

People of various ethnic groups have an opportunity to receive newspapers and journals and other information in their native language.

Citizens of the republic of every nationality, just as people of the native nationality, can hold any posts in the organs of state authority and management.

But the deputies have not supported population of the Polish nationality predominant in districts adjoining Vilnius who claimed the right to create national territorial districts and to have a higher educational establishment with instruction in Polish.

Parliamentarians explained that creation of such districts would be inexpedient in a republic having such a small area.

The election of the new Supreme Soviet of Lithuania is fixed for February 24, 1990.

The session will continue tomorrow.

Lithuanian Party Secretary on Upcoming Congress

LD2311091189 Moscow TASS in English 0831 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Vilnius November 23 TASS—By TASS special correspondents Yuriy Sizov and Kazis Uscila:

The 200,000-strong Lithuanian Communist Party now preparing for its 20th congress is set upon the course of radical social renewal.

Commenting on the priority tasks of the forum which will open on December 19, Lithuanian Communist Party Secretary Valerijonas Baltrunas said that the Congress would discuss a programme of priority actions.

These actions aim to overcome negative trends in the economy, to stabilise the political situation, to raise the party's role in the social life of the republic and to examine crude distortions of socialism committed during Stalin's years.

It is also planned to reshuffle the Central Committee which "should include new forces that have come to the fore during the perestroika years," Baltrunas said.

[Word indistinct] are also set to approve their own rules and parties of union republics were guided in their activities by united policy-making documents of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Explaining the reasons for such a decision, Baltrunas noted that "the degree of the republic's political and economic independence needs corresponding independence of the Communist Party, the republic's driving force".

The secretary emphasised at the same time that he sees the future of the Lithuanian Communist Party within the Soviet Communist Party but as its independent part.

There are conflicting trends within Lithuanian perestroyka. Even during the present discussion in the party, some make proposals which can split the party. The drafts of the party programme and rules published by the republican press are provoking a lively debate in society.

"As a Central Committee secretary, I cannot approve these draft documents which lack the party's ideological basis: the teaching of Marxism-Leninism as well as the notions of socialism and Soviet power," Baltrunas stressed.

He criticised adventurist statements by radicals, noting that "their actions can have unpredictable consequences for society. Therefore, while making decisions, the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee should put the unity of the party first".

Speaking about sentiments of some section of Lithuanian society, which link the republic's independence and sovereignty with secession from the USSR, Baltrunas noted that "Lithuania is so integrated in the all-union economy and has such political and cultural ties with the rest of the country that their severance may hamper the nation's developments".

At the same time, analysing the reasons for the aggravation of ethnic relations in Lithuania, the secretary blamed "the deteriorating economic situation" for the present state of affairs. In his opinion, the way out lies in "economic independence and transition to regional cost-accounting".

"Our Central Committee is completing the drafting of a programme for priority anti-inflationary measures, which will help stabilise the consumer market," Baltrunas said.

Vilnius Military Commander Discusses Parade

90UN0276A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 4 Nov 89 p 4

[Article by N. Smirnova: "To the Parade!" by N. Smirnova]

[Text] Military hardware appeared at night in the center of the city only once, but telephones started ringing in the newspaper offices. The most frequent question, of course, was: What happened? More fat was thrown into the fire by one of the local newspapers. It remarked that tanks in the streets look more like a demonstration of military power than preparation for a holiday parade and, moreover, tanks never enhanced any holiday.

But any mention of military power naturally excites emotions. We asked the military to explain.

"I cannot understand who is stirring up passions and for what purpose," said the commander of the Vilnius Garrison. "It is no secret to anyone that the garrison troops conduct parades every year to celebrate the revolutionary holiday. And we are just keeping up the tradition. As you know the first parade was held in November of 1941. That must mean a lot: A distinctive military ritual was born which served to show the coordination and professionalism of the troops. The only purpose of it is to report to the people in our own way about our preparedness to defend their interests and to defend the motherland. For instance, military guards also parade before the arriving heads of governments and countries, but that does not mean anyone is threatening anyone. I would like to mention also that the information about tanks in the street is not exactly true: Wheeled vehicles are different from tracked ones and have nothing in common with tanks. And only the wheeled vehicles were used to prepare for the parade. Why do we train at night? Honestly speaking, the military are as human as everybody else and they also would like to sleep at night. But we did not want to upset the rhythms of city life and to disrupt traffic even though we have been practicing and getting ready for the parade since 20 September. But with two exceptions all this has been done on the territory of our base. Twice we conducted our practice in the city on the exact location where the parade would take place: We had to make our soldiers familiar with the place where they would have to march to the sounds of their brass band. It is always necessary to familiarize yourself with the location and to work on coordination. If you want to see our preparations you are welcome to take pictures."

We took advantage of the offer and photographed one of the days when the personnel of the Vilnius garrison was getting ready for the holiday celebration.

Norilsk Gas Supplies Normalize After Explosion

PM2411122989 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Nov 89 Second Edition p 4

[S. Blagodarov report: "Trial by Cold"]

[Text] As already reported, on the night of 15 November, 300 kilometers from Norilsk, a powerful explosion occurred on the gas pipeline, severely limiting the city's gas supply. It reduced the capacity of the Norilsk Mining and Metallurgical Combine to a minimum, the temperature in apartments dropped, and classes in some schools were canceled.

Another example of heroism in peacetime: In a blistering wind and searing frost, workers from the "Norilskgazprom" and "Truboprovodstroy" Trust and teams from Urengoy did not stop their repair work for a single hour. The gas supply was restored. What is the situation today?

"Instead of 19 million cubic meters of gas, we are currently getting 11 million," V. Alkhimenko, second secretary of the Norilsk City Party Committee [gorkom], said. "Unlike previous days, today we have not had a single telephone call from inhabitants complaining about the cold in their apartments. All four heat and electric power plants in the Norilsk industrial region and the city of Dudinka are getting back to normal as far as heat supply is concerned. It is still too early to talk about total normalization, but it is important to stress that we have not allowed a single apartment to freeze up and our industrial enterprises are getting back into a normal working rhythm."

All three lines of the gas pipeline were put out of action by the explosion. The first of them is now completely restored, while the second has been connected up to the main pipeline and is being filled with gas. A full gas supply can be expected in the very near future.

It is still too early for final conclusions, but, according to preliminary assessments, the cause of the leak and subsequent explosion was the sudden drop in temperature: from 4 to 41 degrees of frost.

The temperature in Norilsk is now 33 degrees below freezing. The second secretary of the Norilsk party gorkom assured me that he has seen open apartment windows in Norilsk.

ARGUMENTY I FAKTY Editors on Criticism

90UI0131A Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 46, 18-24 Nov 89 p 2

[Article by ARGUMENTY I FAKTY Editor-in-Chief V. Starkov and Deputy Editors-in-Chief N. Zyatkov, A. Meshcherskiy, and L. Novikova: "Why Are They Criticizing ARGUMENTY I FAKTY?"]

[Text] In many of their numerous telegrams and letters in support of the editorial office of the weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY and its editor-in-chief, the readers insist that the complaints made against ARGUMENTY I FAKTY be published.

Strange as it may be, we will have to return to the era of stagnation in order to respond to these questions. Paradoxically, at the time only one serious call to appear at the CPSU Central Committee occurred when the publication reported that about 50 billion in uncalled currency for which the deliveries of goods were not available was on hand in the country, that is, the rate of inflation at the time was shown.

In the era of glasnost, calls to appear at the Department of Propaganda, later renamed the Ideological Department of the CPSU Central Committee, became the rule. The editorial office took it in stride realizing that the proclaimed policy of glasnost is not an open door leading to information which is neatly compartmentalized, but a process of struggle in which there is the interested party, the people, and the [party] which is not interested—those who abide in the so-called "criticism-free zones."

Judge for yourselves: Two years ago we were severely criticized after publishing the interview with Academician A. Samsonov "To Know and Remember" in which he evaluated critically the cult of Stalin's personality and his activities as a military commander.

After the 19th party conference we were faulted for the point of view stated by the writer V. Dudintsev to the effect that a multiparty system, while unrealistic at present, does not run counter to socialism in principle. At the same time, we were told that the publication of the items of expenditure of the MSZMP [Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party] party budget is harmful because it prompts our Communists as well to demand that similar data be released.

In the fall of last year, following the publication in ARGUMENTY I FAKTY of a set of letters from readers on the need to find paper for the free, open subscription to all newspapers and magazines rather than restrict such subscriptions, the former Deputy Head of the Department of Propaganda V. Sevruk demanded that the journalists who had compiled this set be fired and the management of the publication be punished. It came to the point of the chief of the sector of newspapers at the Department of Propaganda faulting us for publishing statements by officials such as Chief of the Information Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs G. Gerasimov and the then press spokesman of the Polish Government J. Urban.

At the time, the clouds gathering above the editorial office dispersed because the support of the party leadership was secured.

Subsequently, the editorial office had to write explanatory memos and listen to severe censure on account of

the publication of tragic statistical data on people subjected to repressions in the years of the cult of personality which our authors, the historian R. Medvedev and Academy Member of the VASKhNIL [V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences] V. Tikhonov, quoted in their materials, as well on account of the letter from a reader who called on propagandists and ideological functionaries to come to Pushkin Square for discussions with the informals rather than "convince" them with the clubs of special detachments.

We deliberately do not evaluate these publications in the course of enumerating them because you, our readers, read them at the time. If you so wish, you can reread them and decide for yourselves. However, even this short enumeration suggests that those who called us "on the carpet" would not do so now. Our life is changing, and glasnost is indeed becoming the norm. Things which seemed "heretical" yesterday are now confirmed by archives and witnesses, spoken by people's deputies, and published extensively.

Finally, let us go to the present. Which mistakes have we been faulted for recently? Why is the editor-in-chief being transferred to another job, and they intend to subject the editorial office to "reinforcement?"

No general analysis was made. They only pointed out individual materials that are not to the liking of our readers "on high." For example, that the material covering the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet Commission for examining the matters associated with the work of the Gdlyan investigative group which has investigated the cases of corruption among the apparatchiks in Uzbekistan and other republics was not "the right kind," that a review of writings in the Western press about the CPSU Central Committee Declaration on the Situation in the Baltic Area was published in an "inadequately critical" manner, that "the wrong emphasis" was laid and "in the wrong places"—generally, the list of such complaints was not extensive. Our publications associated with the issue of social justice may also be included here.

For example, we wrote about some privileges which the apparatus has usurped for itself. Thus, we published a letter from workers building a luxurious house for the elite in downtown Moscow. Nobody except ARGUMENTY I FAKTY wanted to publish this letter. We verified it: The house is indeed being built in grand style: There are huge hallways and imported equipment, and so on. This house is being erected at a time when the housing situation of thousands of Muscovites is difficult. We should say that there was no direct criticism of this material. However, peals of thunder from somewhere "on high" reached us, and from these peals we gathered that they were unhappy with us. This was despite the fact that the letter was written by workers, that is, representatives of the class whose interests are fundamental to the policy of the party.

Dissatisfaction with the article by the Leningrad essayist S. Andreyev was also expressed. The article carried a warning on the possible unfavorable turn of events and restoration of the old in our country. We sort of "scripted" the situation in which this could be done. We wanted to warn both the readers and the leadership of the country about a possible danger by way of this article. The title of the article was characteristic: "Projection Which Should Not Come True." Now we are being faulted for this, as if this has been close to provoking disturbances and a civil war!

It is hard to say how the analysis of these "heretical" materials is done and how their evaluation is arrived at: The distance between "the accuser" and the "accused" is great by design. Wise people from the apparatus advise: Do not argue, agree with everything; otherwise, they will say: He is insolent, obstinate...

As a rule, explaining yourself in such cases is useless: The arguments are heard in a purely formal manner. You realize that someone, somewhere has already resolved everything.

It seems to us that the criticism of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY is a pretext for punishing ARGUMENTY I FAKTY for the edification of others. However, hardly the most opportune subject has been selected.

The position of our publication is moderate and balanced in principle; as a rule, the authors of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY are specialists rather than journalists. In the process, we try to select the highest caliber authors, those who are able to respond to the questions of concern to our readers in the most competent and authoritative manner. Many such issues have accumulated in our society; we receive more than 10,000 questions a week.

As we see it, the choice is also unfortunate because ARGUMENTY I FAKTY enjoys considerable authority among all strata of the population of our country. It may be that this is exactly what frightens those who have decided to kill two birds with one stone: Dress the press down and make the already mature publication with a circulation of 31.5 million in 1990 "malleable."

Following many recent conversations at the CPSU Central Committee, it was once again proposed that the editor-in-chief of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY resign or, more precisely, transfer to another job.

Despite the fact that the editor-in-chief admitted in the course of these conversations that a number of critical remarks were justified, it is hard to agree that the removal from the job is the only way out. Moreover, the editor-in-chief of ARGUMENTY I FAKTY would like to continue the work which has brought the support of millions of subscribers in view of the fact that this step would strike a blow at perestroyka and glasnost, would undermine the faith of our readers in the course of renewal proclaimed by the party, and would make foreign political and business circles doubt the stability of

the situation in our country. This [the support of readers] is confirmed at the very least by the fact that they have been "voting" in favor of the newspaper's line and policy by increasing subscriptions to it every year. Likewise, this situation does not provide a base for the accusations voiced concerning the erroneous political line of the publication as a whole because not only the editor-in-chief and the collective of the newspaper, but also all of our readers would be "guilty" of that.

The behind-the-scenes removal from his job of the editor-in-chief of the organ of a public organization, the All-Union Znaniye Society, appears illegal to us, and not only because this may bring back the sad practices of past year when the fate of people was decided in the peace of offices. At present, in the absence of the press law and other legal acts, there is no guarantee whatsoever that other publications will not be decapitated afterwards.

Editor Starkov Interviewed

PM2411111389 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 22 Nov 89 p 1

[V. Gorlov feature on ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, A & F, circulation, including account of interview with V.A. Starkov: "A & F Is Increasing Its Lead. PARI Agency Registers a New Record. Circulation of Weekly ARGUMENTY I FAKTY to Reach 31,500,000"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] The task assigned me by the editorial office is a celebratory one, so to speak. I am to tell my colleagues from the weekly that they have been entered in the "PARI Book of Records" which is now being compiled by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA journalists. PARI is a kind of Soviet version of the famous "Guinness Book of Records." The reason? The fabulous circulation of A & F for 1990. From now on readership is to total 31.5 million.

"Vladislav Andreyevich,"—I open my conversation with the editor in chief with an honest admission—"to be frank, when I interviewed you a year ago I was absolutely sure that 20 million copies was your limit. What scope for growth is there left, where are more subscribers to be found when there are so many interesting publications around and, moreover, new ones are coming out? Competition has appeared!"

Vladislav Andreyevich Starkov smiles:

[Starkov] I told you all our secrets last year. What more is there to add?

[Gorlov] Does this mean that the newspaper's main creed remains information, frank dialogue with the readers, and answering without fail any question that is of interest to a large number people? However, is guessing the "popularity" of a question not the most difficult task of all?

[Starkov] We take our cue from events of concern throughout the country and from questions which may escape an editor but which affect the interests of the housewife, for instance. Therefore we devote equal attention to, and treat with equal respect, the universal interest in, for instance, the situation in Vorkuta and the concern of the mother of a servicemen who wants to know about food rations in the Soviet Army.

Our reader is fairly well informed. The press today offers him an extensive "menu" and why should he have to "chew" through yet another item only to say with disappointment when he has read the last line: "But I knew this already."

[Gorlov] An editor is a busy man. He has a mass of extra-editorial concerns, so to speak. Do you manage to keep the creative work of all your staffers within your field of vision?

[Starkov] First of all, an editor has deputy editors. Second, frankly speaking, I am lucky with my team. And third, the team is not so big as not to be able to find time and have a chat with every staffer one on one, as the saying goes.

[Gorlov] You continue to favor a "compact" team?

[Starkov] I don't like changing my views. Experience, too, means something. It is easier for people who do not want to strain themselves to get a foothold in a large editorial team.

[Gorlov] There is something else that puzzles me: Your journalists are nameless...

[Starkov] Give me one big name in present-day journalism. And another thing, I must repeat, I do not believe in an editorial office made up of "stars." Who is going to do the minor reports? And this kind of information is very necessary.

[Gorlov] You are familiar, of course, with the draft law on the press?

[Starkov] Of course.

[Gorlov] What are its strong and its weak points?

[Starkov] There is much that I like in the draft law. For instance, the absence of censorship. The introduction of order in relations between the editorial office and the newspaper publisher... I understand, of course, that a newspaper is above all a question of ideology. But who is to decide what is allowed and how it should be written and what sphere of life is outside a newspaper's sphere of competence? Up to now this has been decided by individual people and individual organs which plead service to high authority. Where are the criteria? Most probably it should nonetheless be the publisher who answers for his publication without any interference from outside.

Truth is born in argument—it sounds banal, but we have not invented it. Different views, different thoughts, different stances—and somewhere in the middle lies the truth. What is the most important thing for all of us

today? To achieve a situation in which the country can heave a sigh of relief. And the press has a special responsibility here.

[Gorlov] Do you have problems with your publisher?

[Starkov] We are the organ of the All-Union "Znaniye" [Knowledge] Society. In my opinion, we have found a common language on almost all questions. And, it seems to me, we are fulfilling our mission. And, moreover, we pay a considerable profit into society's coffers.

[Gorlov] How much?

[Starkov] This year our profit was around R50 million. Next year another R10 million or so will be added.

[Gorlov] As of 1 October A & F has achieved its aim, it has become economically accountable, has it not?

[Starkov] Economic accountability—these are big words. We are trying to find our bearings. But so far, I assure you, there is no more money in our staffers' pockets. And, judging by appearances, there will be no increase commensurate with the increase in circulation. We have hired a bookkeeper and an economist. Incidentally, they are having to sit in the corridor.

[Gorlov] On the subject of 42 Kirov Street...

[Starkov] You know about that, too? This detached building with a floor space of 3,500 square meters has indeed been promised to us. However, its 38 current occupiers have no intention of leaving. They are saying that they also need the building and that moreover it is an architectural monument. They tell us: "You will come and..."

[Gorlov] Which service does 42 Kirov Street house?

[Starkov] It is the USSR Ministry of Health healthy living propaganda section.

[Gorlov] And what is your personal view of healthy living?

[Starkov] My wife says jokingly: You have two jobs. One at the editorial office, obviously. But what time is there to peruse the whole of the press and to deal with the mail? That can only be done at home, burning the midnight oil. It is not exactly conducive to health.

[Gorlov] But now, on sick leave, you surely can find time to read?

[Starkov] I am not very well. Some sort of catarrh. It will pass. But as for reading... You will excuse that I have not unplugged the telephone. After all, you cannot unplug yourself, just because you are on sick leave...

[Gorlov] A & F is a popular publication. What does it feel like to be at the helm?

[Starkov] It is probably difficult for you as a journalist of a "big" newspaper to feel the attention of the readers. After all, you are part of a team that numbers hundreds of people. But we, how can I describe it most accurately, are simply physically aware of those 20 million subscribers who read us. I have never been on an island in the middle of an ocean. But that is probably what it feels like.

[Gorlov] Even though you keep your telephone numbers "secret"?

[Starkov] The "secrecy" is a consequence of pure necessity. It is not easy in the middle of the city to manage to get an extra number or two from the telephone exchange. If we made public the 12 numbers that we have it would result in complete paralysis. Even so the telephones are not silent. Our newspaper has failed to appear in several oblasts in the Ukraine and the result was a veritable barrage of questions. What can we say?

[Gorlov] That there is a shortage of paper.

[Starkov] We have done that via the newspaper.

[Gorlov] Do you remember, a year ago you told me that you regard Roy Medvedev as the foremost historian of our time?

[Starkov] In principle I still think that. But times are rapidly changing. Roy Medvedev, as it were, pointed our way to the themes which we opened up for readers later. The original versions of Alliluyeva's reminiscences about her father, and Trotskiy's about Stalin...

[Gorlov] I asked you then: "Is there anything in the editorial folder that you would like to publish?"

[Starkov] And I replied: "Khrushchev's report to the 20th Party Congress." It has been done.

[Gorlov] And now, what is in that folder now?

[Starkov] Solzhenitsyn. Excerpts from a publicistic work "The Oak and the Calf. A Memoir." [Bodalsya telenok s dubom].

[Gorlov] When will we be able to read it?

[Starkov] In one of the next issues, I hope.

RSFSR Supreme Soviet To Convene 28 Nov

90UN0261A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian
12 Nov 89 Second Edition p 1

[Proclamation of the Presidium of RSFSR Supreme Soviet on Convening the RSFSR Supreme Soviet]

[Text] The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] hereby decrees:

The convening of the 12th Session of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic of the 11th Term on 28 November 1989 in the city of Moscow.

[Signed] Chairman of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet V. Vorotnikov
Secretary of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet S. Chistoplyasov
Moscow, 10 November 1989.

The Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet announces that it intends to raise the following questions for consideration at the 12th Session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet:

1. The draft of the state plan for economic and social development of the RSFSR from 1990.

2. The draft of the state budget of the RSFSR for 1990 and the fulfillment of the RSFSR state budget for 1988.

3. The approval of the proclamations of the Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

Union Republics Department Described

LD2111144189 Moscow TASS in English 1417 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 21 TASS—The Union RePublics Department, recently set up within the USSR Foreign Ministry, is faced with the task of enlisting the foreign ministries of union republics in the shaping of Soviet foreign policy and promoting their participation in the work of international organisations, in economic cooperation with foreign partners.

Head of the new department Yuriy Kuplyakov says that previously the actions of union republics in the international arena were almost always carried out through Moscow, while the role of republican foreign ministries was reduced to a minimum.

The main purpose of our department, Kuplyakov told TASS, is to help republican foreign ministries strengthen their working contacts with other union republics. It will also deal with problems of foreign policy affecting the interests of union republics.

Constitutionally Soviet foreign policy is effected through a single federal centre. Therefore, Kuplyakov believes, there is no need to have separate republican embassies and consulates. Another method is more advisable. The personnels of Soviet diplomatic missions abroad could be increased by representatives from republics that have priority interests in this or that country.

Such a practice, Kuplyakov notes, already exists, but it should be further developed and improved.

More than 20 million fellow-countrymen now reside permanently abroad, Kuplyakov said. Many emigrants from Russia, Ukraine, Belorussia, Armenia and the Baltic republcs still speak their native languages, observe their customs and maintain contacts with their homeland. It is natural, therefore, that the union republics are eager to expand political, cultural and economic contacts primarily with states to which their fellow-countrymen have emigrated. The factor of geographical proximity is also very important.

Representatives of union republics are already invited to diplomatic neotiations, to take part in visits of Soviet leaders abroad.

Taking account of the close relations existing between Finland and Estonia, Vayno Vyalyas, Estonian Communist Party chief, was included in the Soviet delegation which accompanied President Gorbachev during his visit to Finland. Foreign Minister Nikolay Neiland of Latvia took part in recent negotiations with Swedish Foreign Minister Sten Anderssen. This practice will be expanded, Kuplyakov stressed.

Ryzhkov Discusses Economic Management Draft

LD2211041689 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 21 Nov 89

[Report on interview with USSR Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, by parliamentary correspondent Vyacheslav Terekhov; date and place not given]

[Text] After the Supreme Soviet turned down for the second time the government-proposed draft law on the general principles of running the economy and social affairs in union and autonomous republics, our parliamentary correspondent Vyacheslav Terekhov asked the prime minister, Nikolay Ryzhkov to comment

I am very worried, of course, the prime minister said. I think that the common solution should be finally found. When the draft law was turned down the first time it was fair, because the document was outdated. Now to my mind, we've worked out a document that takes into account other laws. Though they have not been agreed by the Supreme Soviet, such as the laws on land, property, and others, I think that the draft law on the general principles of economic management can be submitted for the third time only after all the key laws regulating the country's economic life have been passed.

Some MP's from the Baltic republics at the session have claimed that the government does not want to place enterprises of national ministries in those republics under the jurisdiction of the local authorities. Leaders of the Baltic republics demand full control of all enterprises of national significance. This is a question of principle, and here our views differ. The State Planning Committee has agreed to give up part of the industrial facilities in question. However, representatives of the republics say either everything or nothing.

But this is not simply a question of the desire or reluctance of the government. We cannot perform the transition without asking their labor staffs. We have had the sad experience of part of industrial facilities in Belorussia being placed under local jurisdication without the consent of the workers, who sent protest messages; and I was forced to admit my mistake. The same will

happen in the Baltic republics. For example, out of the 60 plants and factories in Lithuania, the State Planning Committee is ready to give (?the rest of) the Lithuanian Government, only 7 have agreed to the transition.

Nikolay Ryzhkov ascribed the reluctance to the fear of the labor staffs that they will lose their contractors, and that the orders of ministries will be replaced with orders from the local authorities. He also said that the question of the jurisdiction of industrial facilities was a temporary one because after the appearance of the socialist market in the country, plants and factories will not have to obey anyone's orders. In their words, they will be guided by a clearcut tax system, laws and norms. The prime minister said he hoped such a market would emerge by the mid-90s, but this requires the elimination of the budget deficit not later than the end of 1992.

Secretary Yakovlev on Perestroyka, Initiative

PM2311211989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Nov 89 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "A.N. Yakovlev: Perestroyka, Initiative, Independence"]

[Text] A meeting has been held at the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [Komsomol] Central Committee's Higher Komsomol School between A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and students, graduates, teachers, and scientific staffers at the Higher Komsomol School, as well as the editors of the country's youth publications.

In his speech A.N. Yakovlev dwelt on certain issues connected with the features of the present time in the party's domestic and international policy today.

The new political thinking, he said, is a clear recognition of the unconditional priority of common human values. It is a struggle not merely in words but, above all, in actions for their triumph and affirmation as the supreme political factor in relations between states. It demonstrates the need to continue the course of improving the atmosphere and the very content of policy in a contradictory but increasingly integrated and interdependent world. It is a concept of socialism as an organic part of modern civilization and marks a return in practice to common processes of world development.

Perestroyka is a supremely dynamic social phenomenon, he went on to note. Its concept is being developed by life itself. The process of interpreting it is continuous. The main thrust of this development lies in the increasingly profound understanding of the essence and content of the necessary changes, the extent of their seriousness, the depth of the reasons behind them, and the difficulties involved with implementing them.

A.N. Yakovlev then drew the students' attention to what are, in his view, the three most important consequences of this premise.

First, there will still be many "discoveries" insofar as the technology of the new model of social life is concerned. Take democracy: It would seem that everybody, or almost everybody, is in favor of it when presented as an abstract—obliterated, as it were—concept. However, when democratization started showing its true colors, we could see its improving, transforming impact in practice, but we also sometimes failed to understand its essentially social importance. We saw in concrete, meaningful, and tangible terms just how much was lacking in our superstructure and how much of it was hopelessly obsolete. These are natural difficulties associated with the practical phase of perestroyka, but this in no way dulls their impact. It merely heightens it. It could be said that these issues are now at the epicenter of perestroyka and largely determine its fate. We cannot treat them merely as applied or "technical" problems.

Second, as perestroyka and its theory and practice develop, the social base is evolving too. And it is largely different today from what it was 3 or 5 years ago. Is this always taken into consideration in our practical work? I think not.

On the one hand, there is the concept of perestroyka which, let us be blunt, conflicts with many long-held scholastic stereotypes in our practical actions, and with prejudiced views. On the other hand, the practice of perestroyka directly affects the real interests of millions of people. There is, as it were, a filtration of the social base: Perestroyka increasingly brings to the fore those who organically combine a complementary interest in the transformations that have begun and philosophical views which open up rather than block the road to renewal, and prevent any egoistic tyranny over the individual. This new social base, unlike its predecessor, does not always coincide with certain sectors of existing political and other structures. And that is why it needs new organization and mobilization.

Third, perestroyka has objectively put us in the position of trailblazers —whereby the example of others, although in general terms important and useful, cannot be carried over into our own problems. Very many issues appeared straightaway, but it is far harder to find the answers.

The main difficulty is our habit of spiritual parasitism, the desire to know the truth from the outset, to acquire an ideal, and then to base our life on it. The scenario whereby an ideal is initially posited from on high and life adapted to fit it is idealistic and illusory, since it is predicated on the passivity of the masses. Many people ask the center to give them a concept of socialism. To give them a theory of party, ideological, and other work under the new conditions. Perestroyka means initiative and independence. That is its essence. We have to venture and seek—ultimately, we have to take risks. Any revolution requires courage, responsibility, and a lofty sense of serving the ideals of freedom.

It is said that there is no precisely formulated, clear goal for perestroyka mapped out day by day or year by year. Socialism is a living creation. If that is not just a slogan but a conviction, then the people themselves will grope their way forward in the process of life, come up with solutions, and reach their goal.

A question heard increasingly often is: Why is a resolute struggle not waged against those standing in the way of transformations? There is a case to answer, of course. However, it is not simply a question today of witch hunts and guilty parties but of nationwide consensus, standards of relations, creative discoveries, and achievements—not the clashes of ambition or the collisions of intolerance.

We would be wholly unsuitable Marxists—if Marxists at all—were we to seek explanations for social processes solely in the subjective approach. The identification and persecution of differing viewpoints is a well-known but pointless task. One of our mistakes was that we essentially failed to apply the methodology of scientific socialism to the study and renewal of our own society on the basis of alternate comparisons and free debate.

Without removing responsibility from the individual, of course, we must look at the conditions in which individuals are placed—conditions which isolated individuals are powerless or unable to change. But it is important that even in reactions to fundamental changes in the environment the prevailing force should be reason rather than emotion, which often blinds people and creates distorted impressions.

A.N. Yakovlev dwelt on the questions of attitudes to criticism from the mass media and the role of the intelligentsia in the perestroyka process. The impression is sometimes given that the press takes the blame and bears the responsibility for the difficulties and shortcomings it describes. Critical articles would only have to end for the situation to right itself. But society lived for decades in an atmosphere of silence, and there was no lack of problems or shortages. Criticism produces hostility because it forces people to give the people answers, to take measures, and to work where previously they could twiddle their thumbs or sanction irresponsibility. The mass media are a bastion of perestroyka and a bastion of a free socialist society—provided, of course, that their output is accurate and based on verified, factual material and professionalism. But we should not shoot the bearers of bad news.

Confrontation with the intelligentsia is inconceivable for a free society too. Our intelligentsia has already made a tangible contribution to perestroyka. The intelligentsia comprises a considerable proportion of working people—a proportion which is growing and determining the pace and effectiveness of spiritual, scientific, and technical progress. The renewal of socialism and the successful progress of perestroyka persistently require its active participation—something for which the intelligentsia has already shown itself to be ready. Artificial suspicion is immoral.

In conclusion, A.N. Yakovlev answered numerous questions from the meeting participants.

CPSU Nomenklatura Seen Coming to End

AU2311092389 Warsaw ZYCIE PARTII in Polish 15 Nov 89 p 13

[Commentary "Especially for ZYCIE PARTII" by Dmitriy Gaymakov, NOVOSTI political commentator: "Nomenklatura—The Beginning of the End"]

[Text] Recently, Soviet society's attention has been focused on a problem that has been a subject of general interest for decades—the so-called nomenklatura system.

A CPSU Central Committee department has developed a new concept of appointing leadership cadres, having submitted to the Central Committee proposals on how to improve this work. "I think one can confidently say that today is the beginning of the end of the nomenklatura in the negative sense of the word, " says Valeriy Sharkov, deputy chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Building and Cadre Work Department. His opinion is all the more important because he is directly involved with cadre problems inside the party leadership apparatus. He examines incoming material and presents it before the said department.

The CPSU's aim to eliminate the nomenklatura in its distorted and inflated shape is a logical continuation of the restructuring course adopted in April 1985. Abandoning administrative-command methods, the party is putting the stress on political methods of influence. One of the most effective of these methods is the training and distribution of leadership cadres. In Valeriy Sharkov's opinion, the experience of restructuring confirms the correctness of Lenin's thesis whereby no policy can be pursued without appointing and distributing cadres and party forces. "However, today's times dictate that the party can only appoint cadres within the framework of the process of democratization in the country," says Sharkov. "Only that way can the difficult task of seeking, preparing, and nominating capable new organizers and practicians of restructuring be carried out."

Major hopes are being placed on the decentralization of cadre appointments. Valeriy Sharkov says that this involves transferring powers vertically first of all, from top to bottom, from higher to lower party committees, with the proviso that the higher committees interfere as little as possible in the cadre affairs of the lower committees, which has not been the case so far. This will encourage greater initiative and independence in the field, and will permit a greater feeling of responsibility in the process of nominating cadres. If the Central Committee approves the Department's recommendations, the Central Committee itself would no longer have to

approve candidates for 800 party functions. Also, oblast and okrug party committees would consign to elected bodies the task of reviewing 12,000 party appointments. "If we succeed in transferring these powers to them, and they succeed in taking these matters into their own hands, then we will indeed increase the number of people directly involved in cadre selection. That is the whole point of the idea," says Sharkov.

The other side of the coin is transferring powers horizontally, whereby party committees would no longer deal with the distribution of leadership cadres among practically every single state body and social organization, but these bodies and organizations would deal with it themselves. This would permit the appointment of cadres according to democratic principles. But, Sharkov stresses, that does not mean in the least that the ruling party will not care about the distribution of cadres to state and economic bodies and social organizations. Of course it will care. No one can deny the party the right to nominate its own candidates to leadership bodies. However, this must now be done according to new principles, without the old pressure and diktat. It must now be done solely on the basis of recommendations, which the relevant body may accept or reject. In addition, alternative candidates would be suggested in every case, whereby candidates suggested by party organizations would compete with others.

The Central Committee department's plan to dismantle the formal and nomenklatura-like mechanism of cadre policy and do away with the so-called control and accountability nomenklatura, which is virtually under the control of party committees, would be a serious blow to existing practice.

"The control and accountability nomenklatura is a list of posts whose tenure is decided by a higher body," says Valeriy Sharkov. "Elected bodies could do exactly the same thing. Yet this work has been taken over by the party apparatus. What is more, it is a party committee department, or, most often, a single employee in this department, who accepts or rejects a nomination. Collective decision-making has been replaced by individual decision-making. Hence all the misfortunes and distortions in the selection of cadres. There is no doubt that abolishing the accountability and control nomenklatura will give representative bodies first choice concerning cadres, and will remove the party apparatus' pressure on the democratic appointment of cadres by state and economic bodies, scientific and artistic organizations, and other bodies."

If the Central Committee department's proposals replace current practice, then openness will replace secrecy, choice will replace lack of choice, appointments will be approved collectively instead of by just one person, and responsibility to the bodies appointing a candidate will replace the self-imposed isolation of leadership cadres. "The processes occurring inside the party and Soviet society require that the very concept of nomenklatura disappear from our political vocabulary," says Valeriy Sharkov.

New Culture Minister Discusses Plans

LD2211125189 Moscow TASS in English 1230 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—By TASS correspondent Olga Svistunova:

"I believe that the main thing today is to heed each other and, material circumstances permitting, to concentrate on the solution of priority problems," Nikolay Gubenko, the newly appointed Soviet culture minister, told TASS. Gubenko is a very popular Soviet actor and stage and film director.

"All I have today," Gubenko said, "is my theatrical and purely human experience. It will take me a month or two, perhaps more, to get my bearings. To be frank, I find it difficult to get used to my new status".

Gubenko stressed that as a minister he did not wish to be "above" anyone. "On the contrary, I want people like actors, directors, artists and writers to be 'above' the ministers," he said.

The new minister does not intend to quit his theatrical career. "I will go on performing in the Taganka Theatre. I hope it will now be directed by Yuriy Lyubimov. I must remain in proper theatrical form. After all I may prove to be a poor minister and find myself bankrupt, an outcome that cannot be ruled out.

"But even if things go smothly, I don't want to remain a minister to the end of my days. I will not cancel my performances this season. Provided, of course, the Council of Ministers does not order me to quit the stage and abandon my profession as something unfit for a minister."

This remains to be seen. But right after his appointment in the Kremlin Gubenko performed the title role in "Boris Godunov" staged by the Taganka Theatre.

Lukyanov Chairs Meeting on Organized Crime

PM2211123789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Putting Up a Reliable Barrier. Presenting a United Front Against Crime"]

[Text] Soviet law-enforcement bodies are called upon to establish efficient cooperation in the fight against organized crime. This was mentioned 17 November at a routine session of the Provisional Committee for Combating Crime in the USSR, chaired by A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Reports were delivered by Ye.A. Smolentsev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Court; V.V. Bakatin, USSR minister of internal affairs; A.Ya. Sukharev, USSR prosecutor general; and F.D. Bobkov, first deputy chairman of the USSR KGB.

The Soviet public's serious concern regarding the increase in organized crime in the country and its professional thrust was stressed at the session. This alarm was reflected by the inclusion on the agenda of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies of the question of combating criminal acts. Many serious crimes, the speakers pointed out, are committed by well-organized and well-equipped groups who often use weapons stolen from troop units and other state establishments. There are cases where criminal elements "merge" with officials. Various nationalist and other extremist groupings, whose actions lead in a number of cases to mass disturbances, are stepping up their activity.

Our country still has insufficient experience of combating organized crime since proper attention has been paid to this problem only comparatively recently. Special subunits and groups of highly-qualified staffers have now been set up under USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, USSR KGB, and USSR Prosecutor's Office bodies to combat organized crime. In the first 6 months of this year alone approximately 500 organized groups, which had committed more than 2,000 crimes, were exposed and rendered harmless with their help.

However, we cannot get rid of organized crime overnight. We not only need an objective picture of the scale of this kind of crime in our country but also in-depth analysis of the socioeconomic reasons for and conditions promoting the spread of crime. We must create a reliable legal base, restore order in crime-prone areas of the economic sphere, and map out a series of measures to combat criminal elements using effective contemporary methods and means of work, along with special technical systems. Law-enforcement bodies must make more extensive use of international experience here.

The committee stressed the need to put into effect within a very short timeframe a special program for countering organized crime. It approved a number of documents designed to step up the fight against crime and strengthen law and order. It was decided to submit these documents for consideration by the impending Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

Biryukova Attends Women's Committee Plenum

LD2411030989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 22 Nov 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] A plenum of the Soviet Women's Committee began work in Moscow today. [passage omitted]

Taking part in its work is Comrade Biryukova. Tomorrow the plenum will continue its work.

Usmanov Visits Ryazan Oblast, Tours Farms

LD2411030389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0700 GMT 23 Nov 89

[Text] Gumer Ismagilovich Usmanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has arrived in Ryazan Oblast. He will acquaint himself with work to implement the decisions of the March 1989 plenum of the party Central Committee. Today, Comrade Usmanov will visit a number of farms, including the Pioner and Pronskiy State Farms and the Kalinin Collective Farm.

A large group of secretaries of oblast party committee who are studying at the institute for raising qualifications of the Academy of Social Sciences of the CPSU Central Committee are also taking part in the trip around the nonchernozem soil area of Ryazan Oblast.

Central Committee Magazine Published

LD2411000789 Moscow TASS in English 1350 GMT 22 Nov 89

[Text] Moscow November 22 TASS—The 11th issue of the magazine NEWS FROM THE SOVIET COMMUNIST PARTY CENTRAL COMMITTEE [IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS]

It opens with a report on the work of the Party Central Committee in October, decisions of the Central Committee Politburo on the results of the September (1989) plenary meeting of the CPSU Central Committee, the work to overcome the aftermaths of the earthquake in the Armenian Republic and the celebration of the 45th anniversary of the Soviet people's victory in the Great Patriotic War (1941-1945).

The magazine informs its readers about a regular meeting of the Bureau of the CPSU Central Auditing Commission, which summed up the results of the execution of the CPSU budget for the first six months of 1989. The budget for the first time provides funds for the needs of primary party organisations.

A report on the work of the Committee of Party Control at the CPSU Central Committee contains the committee's decision on inadmissibility of the conciliatory attitude of some party committees of the Lithuanian Communist Party to Communists whose public activities are at variance with the CPSU rules.

The magazine continues to publish documents by the commission of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on additional studies of reprisals over the period of the 1930s-1940s and the early 1950s.

The issue carries documents on the party rehabilitation of communists in the 1950s and the early 1960s who were expelled from the party on baseless political charges.

The section "In the Run-Up to the 28th CPSU Congress" contains proposals sent to the Central Committee

on new CPSU rules, as well as materials about the discussion at the Moscow City Party Organisation.

Other materials in the issue [passage indistinct] discussion at the Ideological Department of the CPSU Central Committee about work conducted by the party organisation of the USSR State Committee for Public Education, a decision of the plenary meeting of the Bashkirian Regional Party Committee on a programme to improve the ecological situation in the republic, changes in party personnel and events of the party's international relations.

The magazine prints the profiles of Bulgarian Communists Party leader Pyotr Mladenov and German Democratic Repubic Communist leader Egon Krenz.

The issue carries letters by working people to the CPSU Central Committee and reports on measures taken in connection with these letters. At the readers' requests, the magazine gives information about a new edition of Lenin's works and about plans to publish verbatim reports of plenums of the Party Central Committee.

New Rules for Business Travel Explained

PM0211150189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Nov 89 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with E.A. Poch, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Consular Administration, by correspondent M. Yusin under the rubric "Details for IZVESTIYA": "Foreign Business Trip. New Travel Regulations"; date, place not given]

[Text] A new procedure governing the travel of USSR citizens on foreign business trips came into force 1 November 1989. Of what do the new regulations consist, and how do they differ from those in force hitherto? IZVESTIYA's correspondent put these questions to E.A. Poch, first deputy chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry Consular Administration.

[Poch] The resolution adopted by the Council of Ministers "On Improving the Procedure for Travel Abroad on Official Business" is a totally new phenomenon in our practice. The procedure for organizing foreign business trips is substantially simplified, and the makeup of delegations will henceforth be determined directly by the organization sending them.

The decision to send a particular specialist abroad is adopted by the leader of the organization sending him—ministry, newspaper editorial office, enterprise, cooperative. This will make it possible to ensure that foreign trips are more effective. For no one knows better than the leader whether or not his subordinate can be of benefit by going on a business trip to such-and-such a country for such-and-such a purpose. On the other hand, the leader's decision to send a particular specialist abroad also places additional responsibility on him.

I would also like to draw attention to the fact that there will now be a considerable increase in the role of the union republic foreign ministries in deciding questions of travel abroad, because henceforth they themselves will make up passports for foreign travel and apply to foreign missions to obtain visas without involving the USSR Foreign Ministry. These changes are absolutely in the spirit of the times, when the republics' independence is being enhnaced and their ties with foreign countries are expanding. Staffers who will be employed specially on obtaining foreign visas are now being added to the staff of the union republics' permanent missions in Moscow.

Another new element—as of 1 November nine union ministries and departments will be permitted to make up official and general civil passports for foreign travel on behalf of the USSR Foreign Ministry and to apply directly to foreign states' embassies and consulates to obtain visas.

[Yusin] Could you enumerate just which ministries and departments this applies to?

[Poch] The Ministries of Foreign Economic Relations, Culture, Civil Aviation, Railways, and the Fish Industry, the State Committees for Science and Technology, Public Education, and Physical Culture and Sports, and the Academy of Sciences. Not that this is the definitive list. In time analogous rights will apparently be granted to other departments and ministries.

[Yusin] Will all these innovations apply to Russia too?

[Poch] Of course. Russian ministries, enterprises, and organizations will now draw up their own travel documents through the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Foreign Ministry, which, like the foreign ministries of all the other republics, has secured the right to apply to all foreign embassies.

In addition to the union republic foreign ministries, the USSR Foreign Ministry missions in five of the country's cities—Leningrad, Batumi, Syktyvkar, Odessa, and Nakhodka—have the right to apply to foreign states' diplomatic establishments.

[Yusin] Can we hope that the process of drawing up travel documents will speed up after the new regulations have been introduced?

[Poch] We have always sought to enhance promptness in organizing foreign business trips. For example, as long ago as last year the Soviet Union unilaterally pledged to draw up within 48 hours visas for entry to our country for all foreigners coming for purposes of trade, economic, scientific, and technical cooperation. But far from all countries have such regulations. Many foreign embassies in Moscow take 2-3 weeks or even longer to draw up travel documents. We hope that some of them will follow our example and reduce these times. But, as you realize, not everything here depends on us alone.

[Yusin] Do you have figures as to how many citizens of the Soviet Union travel on foreign business trips annually?

[Poch] We have precise statistics only for last year. Some 533,000 people traveled to socialist countries for official purposes, 141,000 to capitalist countries, and, finally, 160,000 to developing countries, not counting crews manning various means of transport. Official data do not yet exist for this year, but it is proposed that last year's figures will increase 20-30 percent. There will be a substantial increase in the flow of tourists and also those people who cross the border on private matters. All this presents Soviet consular establishments with additional tasks—both in our country and abroad.

[Yusin] Eyzhen Antonovich, I have familiarized myself with the new regulations and, frankly speaking, I am still unclear about some things. I assume that questions will occur not to myself alone. Where should people apply for an explanation of particular points in the resolution?

[Poch] You are right. Much is set forth in a concise form in the Council of Ministers resolution and requires additional elucidation. For this a more detailed set of regulations has been prepared—"On the Procedure for Travel Abroad on Official Business"—in which it is possible to find the answers to many questions that arise. The procedures for drawing up travel documents and obtaining foreign passports and visas are set forth in still greater detail in materials prepared by the USSR Foreign Ministry Consular Administration, which are being circulated to organizations which send people abroad.

If people are still unclear about anything after reading all these documents, they should apply to the Foreign Ministry Consular Administration. We have set up a special information and reference group which provides the answers to all the questions that arise in connection with the new resolution. Here are this group's telephone numbers: 241-32-78 and 244-49-08.

Economic

Prosecutor's Office Discusses Economic Crime

PM3110115389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 27 Oct 89 Morning Edition p 2

[S. Taranov report under the rubric "From Competent Sources": "Crimes in the Economy and the Struggle Against Them"]

[Text] A sitting of the USSR Prosecutor's Office collegium held on 25 October discussed the problems of combating transgressions in the economy.

Even the layman can see the scale on which economic crimes have grown in recent years: Speculation, embezzlement, bribe-taking, and various intrigues involving raw materials, finished products, and the prices for them. Contrary to expectations, the scale of the black economy is growing, and specialists now reckon that it amounts to R40-50 billion. Losses from bad management and wastefulness are still way out of all proportion. Assessing the situation, V. Andreyev, USSR deputy general prosecutor, said: "In a certain sense the situation is now close to catastrophic."

The state loses more than R4 billion every year as a result of shortages of material assets, embezzlement of these assets, or their being allowed to go to waste. The agro-industrial complex is among the "leaders" in this respect. More than one-third of all agricultural produce never reaches the consumer, and losses from cattle murrain are approaching R2 billion. A total of 2.4 million tonnes of meat and meat products are lost, wasted, or pilfered in the space of 1 year, as well as 4 million tonnes of vegetables and cucurbits, more than 8 million tonnes of potatoes, and approximately 20 million tonnes of grain, the shortage of which is made up by purchases from other countries for foreign currency.

It was noted at the sitting that some cases of negligence and bad organization by officials border on sabotage. For example, in Glavmosplodoovoshchprom associations alone, losses from produce being allowed to go to waste have reached R45 million. Tens of tonnes of goods in short supply have been allowed to rot in the "Lenmyasocombinat" Production Association. At the same time, trade leaders often make contact with dealers in the black economy. Totally unjustified reserves of goods are being accumulated at warehouses and bases, from where goods in short supply go to speculators rather than to the stores. The USSR State Committee for Statistics has calculated that speculators' income from the resale of industrial goods amounts to R1.1 billion per year. Cases have also been brought to light where trade enterprises have become totally subordinate to criminal elements. For example, for several years Store No. 24 in Baku was "run" by someone called Mamedov, who did not actually have a job anywhere. Successive nominal heads of this "retail outlet" did the every bidding of their "boss," misappropriating more than R200,000 with him.....

Inferior quality goods and foods are still being imported into the country. In 1988 and in the first 6 months of this year, more than 1.5 million pairs of imported footwear and an even higher number of knitwear items were deemed unfit for sale. Because of unnecessary imports, stocks of old, unmarketable goods increase by R40 million every year and stocks have now accumulated to the value of almost R1 billion.....

It is hard in a newspaper report to enumerate all the sources of our losses and every type of economic crime named at the USSR Prosecutor's Office collegium. But they include poor performance by transport, group egoism by enterprises, unjustified price hikes, a clear decline in labor discipline (every day 34,000 people are absent from work for flimsy reasons across the country as a whole, and 5 million man-days are lost as a result of strike action), and gigantic stockpiles of equipment waiting to be installed at plants and construction sites, the value of which now stands at R15 billion.... One can also cite figures illustrating the work of law enforcement bodies: From the number of detected crimes and violations of the law to the number of people

sentenced under specific articles of the Criminal Code. These figures are extremely worrying.

Since the campaign to combat unearned income, which came to an ignominious end, prosecutor's office supervision in the economy has clearly slackened. Investigators are reluctant to take up this kind of case and are afraid to bring them before the courts. Legal science still has not developed new methods and recommendations which would really help in this kind of work. The result is a paradoxical situation: While the number of transgressions is noticeably growing, fewer and fewer people are found guilty of over-reporting, embezzlement, and speculation.

In the conditions of economic crisis and political upheavals, which have a direct impact on enterprises' work, it is very difficult to establish the reason for this or that loss, this or that omission. The borderline between objective circumstances and negligence by specific individuals is being eroded. A great many complaints are being made against the railroads for their failure to supply railroad cars, but, at the same time, tens of thousands of cars have been blockaded, for example, in Moldavia and the Transcaucasus.... Who is to be called to account in such cases?

These and other problems cannot be resolved at a single collegium sitting. Of course, speakers said, we must act with greater resolve, establish the priorities in our work, and improve legislation on the basis of changing circumstances. But the main guarantee of a healthy economy is the success of economic reform.